



THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A FEW months ago the Rev. J. M. THOMPSON, Fellow and Dean of Divinity, Magdalen College, Oxford, published a book on the *Miracles in the New Testament*. He had already published two volumes of New Testament study, from either of which it might have been gathered that the miracles were incredible to him. But this was a small book. It could be easily bought and easily read. After a short but sharp discussion, chiefly in the correspondence columns of the newspapers, Mr. THOMPSON was suspended by the Bishop of Winchester from exercising his office as a teacher of theology in Magdalen College.

Then the editor of the *Guardian* invited three scholars to criticise Mr. THOMPSON'S book, and he invited Mr. THOMPSON to answer them. First came Dr. Walter LOCK, Warden of Keble College, with a single article in the *Guardian* for the 21st of July. After him Dr. Henry SCOTT HOLLAND, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, with three articles. Next the Rev. H. H. WILLIAMS, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford, with two articles. And in the issue for the 1st of September Mr. THOMPSON makes his reply.

Has Mr. THOMPSON read the articles in the *Guardian*? He does not say that he has not read them. But he ignores them. He goes back

to the book without one word about the articles, and 'I should like,' he says, 'to recall our controversialists to the simple question, "Is what I have said true?"'

Now it may be doubted if Mr. THOMPSON had the right to accept the editor's invitation and then ignore his contributors. They are men of as much learning as himself. They have given as much of their lives to the study of the Gospels. But, apart from that, Mr. THOMPSON ought to know that the question 'Is it true?' is often quite unanswerable. He repeats his previous questions. For the most part they are long and complicated. Even if the subject were an easy one, such questions could not be answered with a simple 'Yes' or 'No.' But in so great and so difficult a subject as the supernatural in the Gospels, such a demand is utterly unreasonable. The truth is that in the study of the New Testament we ought by this time to have got beyond the pistol-shot question, 'Is it true?'

'Is it, or is it not, true "that St. Paul believed himself to possess special powers of the Holy Spirit, but that the language in which he himself describes these powers, does not cover anything more than faith-healing, and exorcism, which are instances of natural law, not miracles"?' That is Mr. THOMPSON'S first question. Is it possible

to answer it with a monosyllable? If Mr. THOMPSON demands a monosyllabic answer, the probability is that nine out of ten of the students of the New Testament in this country—we mean men who have studied the New Testament as thoroughly as he has done—will answer ‘No.’ And if they do, where is he then? His whole article proceeds on the assumption that every one of his interrogatives ‘Is it true?’ must receive the answer ‘Yes.’

‘Is it true’—this is his second question—that those miracle stories in St. Mark which fall outside the sphere of faith-healing can be adequately explained by “the tendency to transform natural events into supernatural, the love of assimilation, the ease with which an editor can give a new turn to a passage, and the influence of present interests upon the representation of the past”? Did any man ever spread a net in the sight of a bird before? Mr. THOMPSON has cleverly condensed the whole modern argument against the Gospel miracles into one sentence, and demanded, Yes or No? The argument has been forged from the history of religion. But it is impossible to imagine any one who has studied the history of religion answering ‘Yes.’ We know what the myth-making faculty has done here and there. We certainly do not know that it has ever done all that Mr. THOMPSON assigns to it. Only once, indeed, has it had the chance. That is in the Gospels themselves. For only in the Gospels are miracles such as these to be found. We may think that the Bishop of Winchester was precipitate, but we must admit that any teacher who put so complicated a question deserved to be suspended, for incapacity.

But it is after we have passed Mr. THOMPSON’S interrogatives that we come to understand him. His article is divided into two parts. The second part opens with the familiar statement, that the miracles in the Gospels do not differ from other miracles. ‘The miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury,’ says Mr. THOMPSON, ‘are in many cases of the same kind as those recorded in the

Gospels; they often show the same character of benevolence, the same capacity for illustrating or enshrining spiritual faith; the same naturalness and simplicity; they tend, as the Gospel miracles do, to become more and more miraculous; they could be divided in the same way, and with about as much success, as the Gospel miracles have been divided, into a canonical and an apocryphal series; the better attested of them rest on stronger evidence than any miracles in the New Testament.’

Mr. THOMPSON declares that the miracles of St. Thomas show ‘the same capacity for illustrating or enshrining spiritual faith.’ If by ‘spiritual faith’ he means ‘spiritual truth,’ what a revelation this is of his entrance into the mind of Christ. But if he uses the word ‘faith’ purposely, in order to suggest that the miracles of Christ are like the miracles of St. Thomas in that they also need faith and the same faith to apprehend their value, then what a revelation it is of his conception of faith.

He dares to say that the miracles of St. Thomas often show ‘the same naturalness and simplicity’ as the miracles in the Gospels. And then he says that ‘they tend, as the miracles in the Gospels do, to become more and more miraculous.’ The miracles in the Gospels do *not* tend to become more and more miraculous. There are miracles in St. Mark that are as miraculous as any miracle in St. John. Finally, he says that the better attested miracles of St. Thomas ‘rest on stronger evidence than any miracles in the New Testament.’ From which it is very clear that Mr. THOMPSON does not know what evidence is.

And this is the explanation of his attitude throughout. He takes the miracles of the Gospels in groups, brings forward what he calls evidence for or against them, and so disposes of them in the lump. And when he has disposed of them, as natural events transformed into supernatural, or as due to the love of assimilation, or to the skill with which an editor ‘can give a new

turn to a passage,' he is convinced that he has explained, and explained away, the supernatural in the Gospels.

There is no doubt that the denial of the supernatural in the Gospels is now very common. The most plausible argument against it is found in the history of religion. And Mr. THOMPSON is right when he claims that that argument has not yet received the attention it deserves from the Christian Church. Men who make some claim to scholarship, and who, at any rate in the pulpit, handle the question of miracles occasionally, are in almost total darkness about the history of religion. But that is no excuse for Mr. THOMPSON. For every one of the writers in the *Guardian* has shown himself well acquainted with the argument that the miracles in the Gospels are the slow product of the myth-making faculty. Dr. LOCK even admits that there is a progress in the New Testament from a more human conception of Christ to a more divine. But he claims that that progress is not in myth-making, but simply in interpretation.

'The life described in the Gospels,' he says, 'is admittedly many-sided, and moves on a level far above that of ordinary men. The teaching, the actions, were often misinterpreted in His lifetime; the Teacher was constantly spiritualizing Jewish language, Apocalyptic and other, that He found ready to His hand; His followers were constantly materializing His teaching. The conception of what the Teacher was, grew very gradually in the minds of those who were most intimate with Him. When it had grown, it was shattered by the crucifixion, and gradually it had to be rebuilt and reinterpreted in the light of the Resurrection.'

Dr. LOCK asks: 'Is not such a life exactly the life which most needs some distance in order to see it in true proportion?' He admits, of course, that the Gospels, all the Gospels, are later than most of St. Paul's Epistles; that they come from a Church, and are accepted by a Church, which

was accustomed to St. Paul's high Christology and teaching about the Spirit. And yet, on the whole, he says, they reproduce in a striking degree the thought of the earlier days; they show the gradual deepening of insight into the meaning of the life. And Dr. LOCK concludes with the strong but defensible statement: 'It is therefore as likely as not that the writer of the Fourth Gospel is far nearer to the true interpretation of what Jesus said and did and was than the compiler of Q, that document which is supposed to be the oldest source for the life of Christ.'

There are several promising volumes of sermons in the autumn lists, including three in the 'Scholar as Preacher' series. But it will take a very fine volume to surpass in interest one that is already published by Dr. RENDALL, late Head Master of Charterhouse. And yet the sermons it contains were every one of them preached to boys. The title is simply *Charterhouse Sermons* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net).

Take the sermon on Forgiveness. Most of us make mistakes about forgiveness. But Dr. RENDALL is concerned with the mistakes which boys make. The first mistake which boys make is that when a sin is forgiven its consequences are cancelled. Are they cancelled? Dr. RENDALL declares that life, experience, history, all proclaim the opposite. As Marcus DODS, in his *Early Letters*, familiarly puts it, 'What's did *is* did and can't be didder.' That which is done is done, and cannot even by forgiveness be undone.

And that which is left undone cannot be done. Most appropriately, in speaking to boys, the Head Master of Charterhouse selects the sin of idleness. 'There is no magic,' he says, 'by which in after years you can hope to make good, wasted terms that will never come again.' 'Their record,' he says, 'will be a blank on the day you stand before the judgment-seat, and the books are opened. It is true that the hymn says comfortably, "Time

that's lost may all redeem." But the hymn does not say so truly. Idleness may by God's grace be done away; by repentance, by strain of godly sorrow and forgiveness it may be changed, *re-born* into resolute and energetic desire for service. But the fruits of idleness remain. Their effect in others' lives, and in your own, has passed out of your power to change or better.'

The mischief caused by the notion that consequences can be cancelled is manifold. For one thing, it fosters the idea that the punishment of sin is arbitrary and imposed from without. Do we not even deliberately teach our children that if they commit sin, God will punish them for it? We ought to teach them that they punish themselves. Did not each sin of which even Sir Percival had been guilty rise up against him as he drew near the Holy Grail?

Then every evil word I had spoken once,
And every evil thought I had thought of old,
And every evil deed I ever did,
Awoke and cried, 'This Quest is not for thee.'

And sin begets sin. Separate sins become habits of sin. And then the conflict is lamentably unequal.

And as oft

As Gareth brought him grovelling on his knees,
So many a time he vaulted up again;
Till Gareth panted hard, and his great heart,
Foredooming all his trouble was in vain,
Labour'd within him, for he seem'd as one
That all in later, sadder age begins
To war against ill uses of a life,
But these from all his life arise, and cry,
'Thou hast made us lords, and canst not put
us down.'

Nevertheless there is forgiveness. And the miracle of it is that it makes the sin, not as if it never had been, but better than if it never had been. Dr. RENDALL, speaking to Public School boys, is not afraid to say it makes it better. By God's grace, he says, the forgiven soul, like the

oyster, may 'mend its shell with a pearl.' Where the wound and blemish was, there comes, he says, with the healing, not a scar, but a pearl. We leave the miserable consequence in the hand of a God of healing, and in thankfulness acknowledge that for us the besetting sin is changed, as it were, into a guardian angel. So forgiveness transfigures life.

This is the modern mystery. It is for this that the modern Milton has to rise and say:

What in me is dark

Illumine, what is low raise and support;
That to the height of this great argument
I may assert Eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men.

We dare not sin against God. God forbid that we should ever dream that we may sin against God and not be the worse for it. And yet have we not come to the conclusion, that forgiveness is more than the old military word of command—'As you were'? Have we not come to believe that to whom much is forgiven the same loveth much?

The other mistake that boys make is to think that forgiveness means forgetting. 'Forgive and forget,' the careless proverb says, 'and I read only the other day the eulogy of one who, it was said, knew not only how to forgive, but what is far better, to forget.' That thought makes two mistakes. It misses the virtue of forgiveness, and it misunderstands the work of the love of God.

God does not forget. The All-wise, the All-knowing, the All-caring, He by whom 'the very hairs of your head are all numbered,' He who 'understandeth our thoughts long before,' and 'who putteth our tears into his bottle,' is it possible that He should put away omniscience and forget? Is it desirable that He should forget? When we are sorry for a sin, when we turn from it with shame and detestation, is not our first instinct to

make a clean breast of it, to be rid of the hateful secret? Is it not our strongest desire that He against whom we have sinned should know it to the uttermost? Dr. RENDALL recalls the parable of the Prodigal Son: 'I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him'—hiding nothing from him.

And as we wish the sin to be known, we wish it to be remembered. For the forgiveness of the sin becomes a sacred tie of friendship, affection, and trust. To wish it forgotten is to wish to make it less than it is, and so to make the forgiveness less. It is to repent that it was confessed in all its fulness. It is a treachery to love.

It is a treachery to human love. If I forgive a sin I do not need to forget it. The love that enabled me to forgive is large enough to cover the remembrance of its forgiveness. And if the sin is not forgotten, then it is a holy pledge between me and thee that as long as the remembrance lasts the repetition of that sin has become morally impossible.

And it is a treachery to the love of God. 'My sins are ever before me,' said the Psalmist. For he knew that they were ever before God, and that the remembrance of them gave him the assurance of the inexhaustible love of God, and kept him from continuing in sin.

'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mt 5⁴⁸). In these days of 'No theology, please,' is there any one left who is interested in perfection? There are still some who are interested in it. They are interested in it practically, as a matter of life and conduct; which means, no doubt, that they are much less violently interested in it than if it were a matter of theology and theory. But those who believe that they are already perfect, and those who believe that they never can be—those two classes are interested in perfection still.

Was it to those who are already perfect that our Lord said, 'Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect'? That is clearly impossible. Not because we must take the verb in the future tense. We need not take the verb in the future tense; and we had better not. For if we are ever to be perfect, let us be perfect now. He did not say, 'Ye shall be perfect,' or 'Be ye perfect,' to those who believed they were perfect already, simply because to them He never had anything to say at all. 'They that are whole,' He said, 'have no need of a physician'; 'I came to call sinners.'

To those who believed that they were perfect already, He had nothing to say. It was only incidentally, and turning for the moment, as it were, from His proper work, that He addressed Himself to them at all. And then only to let them understand that they were very far indeed from being perfect. Nicodemus came to him by night. Nicodemus was perfect already. By the very principles of the life he lived, he and all the Pharisees with him were perfect. If they offended in one thing, they offended in all. They knew that. And therefore they persuaded themselves, as they were bound to do, that they had not come short of the demands of the Law through all their life in respect to one jot or one tittle of it. 'Master,' said one of them, 'all these things have I kept from my youth up.' Of course he had; they had all kept all these things.

What did Jesus say to Nicodemus? He did not say that he was not perfect, but He said that he must be born again. He said that if he was perfect on his own lines his perfection was worth nothing. It was worth less than nothing; it was a hindrance to true perfection. He said that Nicodemus must take down all that building which he had built so laboriously and so admirably, and begin at the beginning again. To use His own most graphic and inimitable figure, He said he must start his life over again as from infancy, as a new-born child, in a new attitude

and with a new aim. He said he must be born again.

A rich young ruler came to Him. To the ruler He said, 'Sell that thou hast, and come, follow me.' It is the word to Nicodemus over again. Begin at the very beginning. Sell everything; leave nothing, absolutely nothing, unsold. Give the whole of it to the poor, and then begin a new life in a new attitude, in a new relationship which you will find in Me. Sell and come. These are His two demands always upon the already perfect. Sell, that is, get rid of the whole of the bad method of living; and come, that is, begin a new life with a new motive, a life which not only leads to but actually is perfection.

Nor did Jesus say, 'Be ye perfect,' to those who hold that nobody can ever be perfect on earth. That is as undeniably clear as the other. For it is the earth, you may say, that He speaks about always. In comparison with His interest in the earth, He is just as little interested in heaven as we are. 'Be ye perfect' is the sum of the Sermon on the Mount, and the Sermon on the Mount is meant for this world.

Nor is it a 'Counsel of Perfection' merely. Our Lord never in all His teaching uttered one single 'Counsel of Perfection'—one single precept that could not be translated into life and conduct. This in connexion with the Sermon on the Mount is our grand mistake. It is our fatal mistake. 'I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also'—if that is not meant to be done, there is mockery in the statement of it. Those who deny that it is meant to be done, are living in entire misapprehension of what the Sermon on the Mount is meant for. Certainly it is just as difficult to turn the other cheek as to be perfect; but both precepts are possible here and now, or Jesus had not uttered them.

Now the first thing to notice is that there is at

least one person who is perfect already. 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as *your heavenly Father is perfect.*' Do you say, Of course God is perfect? Well, of course He is; but that is not what our Lord says. He says *our heavenly Father* is perfect. God is perfect as Father, that is what He says. And when is a father perfect? He is perfect when he loves. He is perfect when he loves his children with a perfect love. And love in our heavenly Father is no more an abstract, distant thing than is love in an earthly father. Our Father knows what we have need of. 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him.'

God is perfect as a Father. It is the only perfection in God that we are interested in. It is the only thing that we need to know about in God. And just as it is the perfection of a father that Christ attributes to God, so is it the perfection of a son and no other perfection that He demands from us.

For, first, it is the perfection of a man. It is the perfection of a man with a will, a will to obey or to disobey. Otherwise He would not demand it; He would simply impose it. He does not say to the lilies of the field, 'Be ye perfect'; He simply makes them perfect. And that is just another way of saying that it is not the perfection of the Pharisee. The perfection of the Pharisee is the perfection of a circle. Take your compasses and draw it. Let the two ends meet accurately. Your circle is complete and perfect, but it is not the perfection of a son.

It is not only the perfection of a man. It is the perfection of a man who has been imperfect, who is imperfect still. He has been imperfect. He has not, like the Pharisee, remained at home doing his day's work faultlessly. He has not gone out every morning at the same accurate hour and returned every evening with the same sense of satisfaction, so much work done, so much wages earned. He has been away in the far country.

He has spent his substance in riotous living. But he has come home again. And when he came home, the father said, 'This my son'; 'bring forth the best robe.'

He is imperfect still. Here is the paradox of perfection. We shall be perfect whilst we are still imperfect. That is what our Lord means. He means that we shall be perfect as sons, perfect in having entered into the real relationship of sons, in having the heart of sons, in loving as only sons

can love. 'I am bold to say'—this is the Pharisee:

I am bold to say,
I can do with my pencil what I know,
What I see, what at bottom of my heart
I wish for, if I ever wish so deep—
Do easily, too—when I say, perfectly,
I do not boast, perhaps.

'Father, thou knowest that I love thee.' This is the perfection of the son.

The Present Theological Situation.

By THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., LOGIEPERT.

I.

THE outstanding feature of the theological activity of the last twenty years has been the thorough-going application in the sphere of religion of a method or principle of study which was first applied with good result in other branches of human inquiry. The guiding idea of the nineteenth century—the idea of evolution or development—bade us see everywhere not sudden inbreaks of creative power, but continuous progressive change from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, by means of an immanent power working according to certain observable laws. Fruitful in the world of nature, this scientific conception became increasingly applied to the study of history, converting an atomistic into an organic view of things; until in the latter half of the nineteenth century the method—generally spoken of, in its particular relation to the study of history, as 'the historical method'—employed in the sphere of religion gave rise to a new reading of religious history.

The first application of the new evolutionary conception was within Christianity itself. Its general result was to emphasize the fact that the revelation of God to Israel culminating in Jesus Christ was a gradual progressive revelation, suited or accommodated to the developing religious capacities of the race and individuals. When this was realized, many formerly felt difficulties found a

natural explanation. The imperfect morality of the Old Testament, for example, and the correspondingly imperfect forms of worship which it brings before us, ceased to appear unworthy of a place in the record of a Divine revelation. Doctrines and practices which were morally impossible as the last word of revelation became intelligible when seen in their place as steps or stages in the process.

But this idea, once adopted, could not fail sooner or later to demand a wider and more thorough-going application. An evolution or development there is within Christianity. That is granted. May not Christianity itself also come within evolution? Two things combined to delay until recent years the coming forward of this further question. *First*, there was the belief in the special revelational character of the Christian religion, according to which it was viewed as a religious phenomenon of an exceptional miraculous character extra- or supra-natural in its rise and progress, infallible in its sacred books, over against all manner of false religions—'a holy island in the sea of history.' In the very nature of the case, such a belief discouraged any attempt to relate, for purposes of elucidation or explanation, the religion of the Old and New Testaments to extra-Christian religious history. *Second*, even where such a belief was no longer actively operative, our knowledge of non-Christian religions was so meagre that the indispensable fact-basis for the application of such a method of study was not yet provided. The

recent widening, however, of the horizon of our knowledge of civilizations and religions outside the Christian, through the investigations of scientific workers in many fields, especially in archæology, ethnology, and comparative mythology, as well as the close practical contact with other peoples and their history through geographical exploration, international commerce, and missionary enterprise,—all this has emphasized the resemblances and affinities between religions everywhere, and in particular has encouraged the endeavour to interpret or explain the religion of the Old and New Testaments as far as possible by connexion with or dependence on other religions.

Historically, it is said,—such is the contention of the present—Christianity is but one religion among others, one of the many forms which the religious consciousness has assumed in the long course of its development. It entered the world in certain historical circumstances, it appeared in a certain historical context. Let it be studied then ‘scientifically,’ that is to say, by the principles of historical criticism applied with success in other branches of inquiry. Let it be considered—the religion of Jesus Christ, including its Old Testament preparation—in its place in the stream of religious history, and in essential connexion with religions chronologically and geographically adjacent to it. Only so, it is held, will the nature of Christianity as an historical religion reveal itself: only so will the superiority of Christianity to other religions, if superiority there be, be rationally or scientifically established.

In the field of Old Testament research, this has meant a new interest of recent years in the study of the general religious environment of Israel. Of this new interest the most characteristic outcome has been the rise and progress of a school or movement called the ‘Pan-Babylonian,’ which seeks to show that the influence of Babylonia on the religion and culture of Israel was much greater than Old Testament pioneers, such as Ewald, Robertson Smith, and Wellhausen, had even suspected. This movement was first brought into prominence by the famous *Babel-Bibel* lectures of the Assyriologist, Friedrich Delitzsch, delivered in the winters of 1902 and 1903 before the Emperor in Berlin. The chief names associated with the movement are those of Winckler, Zimmern, Jeremias, Gunkel, and Jensen. The tendency throughout is to convert a great part of the Old Testament

history, and not a little of the New Testament as well, into forms of Babylonian myth. The ethical monotheism of Israel, for example, is traced by Jeremias largely to extra-Israelitish influences. And the New Testament representation of the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus is represented by Zimmern as little more than a repetition of Marduk and Tammuz myths.

In relation to the New Testament, the new point of view has meant a deepening of interest in the question of Christian origins, and a thorough-going attempt to understand much even in the central writings of Christianity through the influence of the non-Christian environment, not only Judaistic but extra-Judaistic—Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, Greek, and Roman. The general point of view in this connexion may fairly well be represented by the thesis of Gunkel, one of the pioneers of the movement, that ‘in its origin and shaping (*Ausbildung*), in important, even in some essential, points the religion of the New Testament stood under the influence of alien religions’ (*Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N.T.*, p. 1).

Of the new interest, more particularly in the Judaistic background of the New Testament, the most significant token is the recent heightened appreciation of the apocalyptic element in our Lord’s teaching. So largely, indeed, is attention devoted to this question that it may, without injustice, be described as constituting the storm-centre of New Testament criticism at the present time. The generally accepted view of criticism for many years had been that Jesus’ teaching concerning the Kingdom of God had to do with the present rather than with the future, and was ethical rather than eschatological. But as the result of more recent study of the Jewish apocryphal literature, as embodied in such a work, for instance, as Bousset’s *Jewish Religion in New Testament Times*, the tendency has been of late to emphasize the apocalyptic element in the Gospels, and to hold that for Jesus the Kingdom was, if not wholly, yet in the main or on the whole, future and catastrophic. It was Johannes Weiss who, in 1892, in his work on *The Preaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God*, started this new mode of interpretation. He maintained that Jesus’ conception of the Kingdom was not partly present and partly future, but wholly future, eschatological, and transcendent. In the second edition of his book, in 1900, Weiss considerably modified his view. But his original

position has been adopted and developed by others who claim to find in eschatology the master-key to Jesus' teaching. Prominent among these is the name of the brilliant young Strassburg scholar, Albert Schweitzer, who in 1906 published his work *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, translated into English under the title of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*—a book which largely through Professor Sanday's characteristically generous estimate has met with much more appreciation in this country than in Germany. In Schweitzer's representation Jesus becomes practically the victim of eschatology, a *Zukunftsfanatiker*, and His whole ethical ideal and teaching is depreciated as merely an *Interimsethik*, conditioned by His belief in the near approach of the end. Just as in time of war, special laws are proclaimed for the special circumstances of the time, to be abrogated as soon as these circumstances pass away, so the moral precepts of Jesus, especially those of a negative and world-despising kind, are to be understood as applying only to a state of affairs which is *interim* and about to pass away.

Now this deepened interest in the question of Israelitish and Christian origins involves, it is evident, a great widening of the province of Biblical exegesis and theology. The old standpoint of Biblical exegesis, according to which for the Bible student there existed only the Old Testament and the New, is gone; and the sphere of investigation has been enlarged to include, not only extra-canonical Jewish religion and literature, but the whole religious literature of the time—Jewish and non-Jewish alike. No longer can it be held to be enough for the explanation of a Biblical idea to take all the scriptural passages where it occurs and, by combining them, arrive at its general meaning. Its antecedents must be inquired into. It must be investigated in the context of general religious history. Heitmüller, for example, seeks to explain the meaning and usage of the New Testament phrase 'in the name of Jesus' by bringing forward analogies in Babylonian, Persian, Mandaean and other forms of religion and worship where the name of the Deity is thought of as itself a part of the Divine essence, the mere utterance of which acts as a kind of charm. And Gunkel, in like fashion, places the whole Christ-picture of the New Testament—not only the Christological presentation of Paul and John, but the Gospel narratives of the Infancy,

Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, Resurrection, and Ascension—in the wide-flowing stream of religious history, and endeavours to explain, or at least interpret, the New Testament representation of Christ by the help of mythological conceptions diffused throughout the Orient, and derived chiefly from Babylonia.

No doubt this new genetic, or embryological, study of Biblical conceptions has been by many, in the enthusiasm of a new love, carried to unwarranted extremes. What is at best analogy has been too often hastily interpreted as evidence of dependence or borrowing, little justice being done to the properly Israelitish and Christian development itself. Under the influence of such methods, some have even undertaken to explain the New Testament representation of Christ without the assumption of the historical personality of Jesus. But such extravagances are not of the essence of the movement, and already the further progress of research is leading to a conservative reaction against such extreme positions. In Old Testament study, for example, the result of placing the religion and literature of Israel alongside the religion and literature of the ancient Oriental world has been to set in a clearer light than ever the distinctive features of the religion of Israel. If somewhat of its previously conceived originality has disappeared in the process—many features which were once thought to be exclusively Israelitish now being known to be common to surrounding peoples—never before has its uniqueness been so convincingly demonstrated. In particular, the outcome of the 'Pan-Babylonian' movement has been to emphasise the fact that Babylonia had almost nothing to teach Israel ethically, and it was from ethical sources within herself, and not from outside influence, that the monotheism of Israel immediately arose.

So also, in New Testament research, with reference to the radical apocalyptic movement, it is being increasingly recognized that a purely eschatological interpretation of Jesus' teaching is unwarrantable. Jesus may have adopted the apocalyptic ideas of His time, but in the very act of adopting them He remoulded and transformed them. He gave them a new moral and religious significance, filling them with a new content which made His teaching independent of the passing thought of the age. Though the eschatological interpretation of the Gospels, no doubt, has a

relative justification in that it has tended to rectify the balance which formerly had dipped too far on the side of a purely ethical interpretation, yet to adopt a merely apocalyptic point of view is to unduly narrow the significance of Jesus' teaching.

Such extravagances in detail, then, as we have referred to, are being corrected by the progress of research itself, and are not to be looked upon as affecting the permanent gains of the new method. Of these gains we may mention three.

First, Biblical exegesis has become for the first time scientific and historical. Hitherto Biblical interpretation had been too much dominated by dogmatic and practical considerations. Men did not ask what the prophets said, nor what the apostles meant, but what God had to tell them by the mouth of His prophets and apostles. The result was that, as Von Dobschütz has pointed out, each generation treated them as men of their own time. In Neander and Godet, Paul is a pectoral theologian, in Baur he is a Hegelian, in Luthardt an orthodox, and in Ritschl a genuine Ritschlian. But now the Biblical writings are seen in their true perspective, against the background of their time, and the first question is—What was the meaning of the men who wrote them, and how were they understood by those to whom they were written? This characteristic of modern exegesis is sometimes called Romanticism, but it is better spoken of as a new feeling for historical sincerity, what the Germans call *Wirklichkeitssinn*.

Second, as the result of this historical orientation of the Biblical writings there has come about a revivifying or revitalizing of Bible study. The Bible, whatever else it is, has become for us in a new sense a genuinely human book, and as such subject in great measure to the same general conditions as mould other forms of human literature.

Third, the new study of religion has enlarged and deepened our conception of the ways of God with men. Just as the Darwinian theory of organic development when truly interpreted, instead of banishing God from the world as was at first thought, has led to a wider and a grander teleology: so the general historical study of religion, by showing us continuous progressive action of the Divine on the human rather than sudden special revelation, will, when realized, lead to a wider and worthier theodicy.

II.

Closely connected with this new interest in the history of religion, with its determinative influence on the conception of the place of Christianity in religious history, is a second, and in some respects more significant, feature of the present, namely, the application of psychology to the interpretation of religious experience. The comparative study of religions, with the auxiliary disciplines of genetic psychology, anthropology, and ethnology, by investigating the growth and development of the religious consciousness racially as well as individually, and emphasizing the essential unity of the religious nature of man everywhere—a unity manifesting itself in similar beliefs, ceremonials, and institutions where similar conditions are fulfilled, has provided the data for a psychological study of religion correlating and interpreting the facts with a view to the discovery of general laws of religious development.

The sphere in which the new science claims to be most serviceable is in the interpretation of the facts of conversion. The literature of the subject, apart from preliminary magazine articles, began with the publication in 1899 of Professor Starbuck's *Psychology of Religion*—a biological, psychological study of the fact of conversion in relation to the phenomena of adolescence. This was followed in 1900 by Professor Coe's *The Spiritual Life*, which, while written from the same point of view, contained a larger element of experimental data more particularly regarding the different types of religious experience. Best known, however, in this connexion is the name of the late Professor James, who, in his Edinburgh Gifford Lectures (1899–1901), *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, made the religious experiences of mankind the subject of most careful scientific investigation.

But more recently the new science has been applied to the interpretation of another department of religious experience—the facts of inspiration and prophecy. Last year there was published a book by the Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden (Dr. Joyce), entitled *The Inspiration of Prophecy*, in which psychology is applied to the explanation of prophetic inspiration, both Hebrew and Christian. Just as in the sphere of religious history, so long as Christianity was set over against all other religions as the one supernatural religion, there was no possibility of the rise of an historical science of

religion, so, as long as inspiration was looked upon as the monopoly of one faith—a break in religious experience as the Christian religion was conceived to be in religious history—there was no possibility of raising the question how far prophetic inspiration could be brought under a law applicable to it and analogous experiences outside the pale of revealed religion. But with the waning of the old mechanical theory of inspiration, and the increasing investigation, under the influence of evolutionary thought, of the religious consciousness in its various manifestations, Christian and extra-Christian, points of resemblance and affinity revealed themselves, and the question was raised whether the prophetic inspirational experience is something altogether apart and distinct, *sui generis*, or not rather the exhibition, though on a higher and more impressive scale, of the same activities as come into play in religious consciousness everywhere. In this book the author, by an investigation into the first beginnings of prophecy and an attempt to trace its connexion with earlier and cruder spiritual manifestations, seeks to show that the fact of prophetic inspiration in Israel was not an abrupt interposition in religious history and experience but rather an evolution out of lower spiritual operations such as those of the diviner and the soothsayer.

This is not to explain away prophecy as a mere natural psychological occurrence apart from Divine influence. The evolution of prophecy is not, any more than the evolution of nature, inconsistent with Divine action. There is nothing derogatory to the Divine in supposing that the means employed by the Spirit of God in the case of the prophet was to heighten and direct psychic powers that belonged in some measure naturally to men of a certain temperament. What it does mean is—and the outcome of it may, with sufficient precision for the present, be defined by saying—that a new mode of conceiving the method of Divine action has been introduced which makes the working of the mind of the prophet more intelligible, bringing it within the domain of law and orderly control. God is no longer conceived as standing apart from human nature, asserting His presence by occasional arbitrary interference with the laws of its working, but as revealing Himself through the psychical laws of man's constitution—over all, yet in all and through all working out His will. The supernatural of revealed religion is

seen to be not the extra-natural but the higher natural, the natural raised to a higher power; and along this line, as we have seen along the line of historical revelation, a new conception of the ways of the Spirit of God with men is introduced.

The science is still in its infancy, and many of its general results may require revision and modification in the light of future inquiry. The significant thing about the new movement is that those at the head of it are not theologians, but scientists who have come to the study of religion from outlying provinces, for the most part from the medico-physiological side. Their interest, accordingly, is not primarily in religion, but in science. Little wonder, then, that up to the present the naturalistic atmosphere of medical and physiological studies has too much surrounded their work, and that ground has been given for the suspicion that the new interpretation of the facts of religious experience is an ally of that all-consuming movement of the day which is directed against the supernatural. The tendency always is, as in the case of the historical science of religion, to investigate the facts of primitive religious consciousness, with the avowed intention of finding therein the key to the understanding of the higher religious consciousness, and as a result to do injustice to the uniqueness of Christian experience. But whatever judgment may be passed upon some of the theories put forward in connexion with the new science, one must recognize how aptly many of the facts collected and systematized for its own purposes serve at least to illustrate the experiences of saint and prophet. Already it can be seen that just as the historical study of religion has revolutionized our thought of Biblical history, so the new study of the psychology of religion is likely to bring about no less a revolution in our conception of Biblical religious experience. So much so that not only for the theologian, but for the preacher—concerned as he is with the interpretation of religious experience to his own generation—the study of the psychology of religion is one of the most imperative duties of the present. Of this Dr. Sanday's recent hypothetical attempt in *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, to interpret the relation between the Divine and the human in the consciousness of our Lord by means of the theory of the subliminal self is but the latest significant token.

III.

The effect of this scientific historico-psychological spirit of recent thought is that Systematic Theology for the present is somewhat in the background, elbowed out of front rank by the two dominant interests of comparative religion and religious psychology. This relative obscuring of Systematic, however, can be but temporary. Already voices are being raised calling for advance to a restatement of Christian doctrine on the broadened basis supplied by recent scientific research and in terms more suited to modern thought. 'Enough of history' (wir haben zu Viel von Geschichte), Weinel was heard exclaiming recently, as he lamented the dominance of the scientific historical interest at the expense of the more properly religious and ethical.

Though the time for such a restatement, however, may not yet have arrived, the whole trend of recent historical and psychological research has been in the direction of making ever clearer what the line of cleavage must be between the dogmatic theologies of the future. The alternative—as reflected in the 'Jesus-Paul' controversy in Germany, and the 'Jesus or Christ' controversy in this country—is to be between what Sanday has called a 'full' and a 'reduced' or 'attenuated' Christology and theology. No longer is it enough to talk of a Christocentric Christianity, and to call 'Back to Christ.' We have to define our Christ. Even with Christ in the centre, the issue is between an anthropocentric Christianity and a theocentric Christianity.

The tendency of the new scientific evolutionary movement in religion is towards the former. Its standpoint is well represented by Bousset in his recent work, *What is Religion?* where the whole history of the religious life of mankind is looked on as the great handiwork of God, 'a constant intercourse of God with man, of man with His maker, in accordance with the stage to which he has attained.' The supernatural is not denied. Rather the whole religious history of mankind becomes a natural supernatural process, the religion of the Old and New Testaments representing but the purest and highest form to which religion has yet attained. The tendency accordingly is to subsume Jesus under a general notion, to make Him one of a class, the greatest religious 'genius' or 'hero' of history, far above all other men, and

in virtue of His life and message truly our Lord and Master, but yet one of a series.

The absoluteness of Jesus for the life of religion is thus challenged to-day from the side of historical evolutionism. The old dogmas must go—the Divinity of Christ, the Trinity, the conceptions of Atonement and Redemption. This 'dogmatic' Christianity is due to Paul. He innovated, it is said, when he made Christianity the religion of redemption or atonement. We must get back from Paul, back from the subtleties and dogmas of the Judaic and pagan theologoumena of the apostles, back to the simple and direct teaching of the Master. And just here, it is claimed, is the great achievement of the scientific scholarship of the past twenty years—the separation, namely, which it has made between the Divine 'Christ of faith' and the human 'Jesus of history.' For practically two thousand years—such is the representation—Paulinism has overlaid Christianity, and the Church has been building on a wrong foundation. For the first time recent scientific research has enabled us to return to the 'religion of Jesus' as distinct from 'the gospel of Christ.'

Now it may readily be agreed that in this new emphasis on the 'Jesus of history' there is much of the nature of real gain. Whatever else it has done, recent study of the historical Jesus has recalled theology to the genuine historical humanity of Jesus as the basis of any worthy dogmatic construction of His Person. In traditional orthodoxy scant justice often was done to this side of the nature of Christ. The human and the Divine in Him were too apt to be thought of as in contrast and opposition to each other, with the result that in general the human was hidden and lost in the Divine. Against this Docetic tendency of the old Christology, historical criticism has been moving in the direction of doing fuller justice to the genuine humanity of our Lord by insisting that the Divine in Him—if Divine there was—must be approached and understood through the human, as it was through the human alone that it could manifest itself.

Not from the Christological point of view only, however, but also in a twofold practical reference, is the new emphasis on the 'historic Jesus' of importance at the present day.

First, from the point of view of Christian missions. Not in Israel alone, but wherever man is feeling after God if haply he may find Him, there is

to be recognized the immanent working of God preparing the way for the fuller light of Christianity. The Western formulation of the Christian faith, however, may appear strange and alien to the modes of thought of other lands. What they want is not our doctrinal construction of Christ or our theories of Atonement; they want to see Jesus for themselves, the Jesus of history who has come 'not to destroy, but to fulfil' the religious longings of their nature, and to bring them to God.

Second, from the point of view of the present demand for social reform. If 'liberty,' the first of the three great watchwords of the French Revolution, was the battle-cry of the nineteenth century, 'brotherhood,' the last of its watchwords, is the rallying cry of the beginning of the twentieth. In the midst of the present social and industrial unrest, men say, 'Let us get behind the Christ of the Churches to the Jesus of history.' 'We would see Jesus'—the human Jesus, the man of Nazareth and Galilee, the friend and brother of the poor and the oppressed.

The genuine humanity of Jesus, however, being recognized as our starting-point, can we rest with that and say that 'Jesus never outstepped the limits of the purely human.' Such is the position of the historical evolutionary school. Bousset, for example, holds that historical research has shown that Jesus throughout His life placed Himself on the side of man, and not on the side of God. He never made Himself the object of faith. He was at most but its first and greatest subject. So the absolute value of Christ for faith is denied, and Christianity reduced to one religion by the side of other religions which have appeared in history—the highest, indeed, that has yet appeared, but not necessarily final and absolute.

Can the absoluteness of Christianity, and of Jesus Christ, then, not be conserved. This is the issue at present between a 'full' and a 'reduced' Christology; and towards deciding this issue the most recent movements of historical criticism itself contribute not a little. The tendency in 'liberal' thought has been to narrow the basis of Christology to the Synoptic Gospels; and even within the Synoptics to limit it to the oldest evangelic tradition that is critically ascertainable. But even in this oldest tradition, as Harnack and others admit, Jesus is given a unique and absolute significance. He is not simply a man, not even the greatest of men, but God manifest in the flesh. He represents

not the ascent of man, but the descent of God. Historical criticism itself has destroyed the fiction that there was ever a time in the history of the Church when it held the 'religion of Jesus' as distinct from the 'gospel of Christ.' As far back as one can go we find only faith in and worship of a risen and glorified Christ, and Wellhausen's attempt in his Synoptic researches to get behind apostolic tradition and the 'Christ of faith' to a merely human prophetic Jesus has broken down.

Recent thought, accordingly, has been compelled to recognize that between the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul there is an essential continuity. The latter is but an unfolding of what is already implicit in the former. The apostle's teaching has, indeed, elements in it which are plainly derived from rabbinical Judaism and from the exigencies of his own dialectic, but these affect its form rather than its content; and the attempt of Wrede and others to find a deep gulf between the Synoptic 'religion of Jesus' and the Pauline 'gospel of Christ' must be dismissed as unsuccessful.

Further, it is being increasingly recognized that for a 'full' Christology and an adequate representation of the Person and Work of Christ there is demanded a wider basis than negative criticism has in the past admitted. The impression which Jesus made upon His followers is itself an element in the estimate which must be formed of Him. And much of 'liberal' Christianity is in this plight: that, if its interpretation of Jesus is true, nothing is left to explain how such an impression could have arisen.

Towards reinforcing these more positive conclusions of recent historical research and helping forward the desiderated restatement of Christian doctrine, the new Philosophy—variously described as Pragmatism (James), Activism, or Vitalism (Eucken, Bergson)—with its emphasis on conscience, feeling, and will as opposed to mere intellect, will have its own contribution to make. When, with the help of the fresh knowledge and the fresh principles and methods referred to, the new synthesis has been attained it will be one in which the central Christian truth of the absoluteness of Jesus for faith will be more clearly recognized than ever—the truth which is the implicit basis and rationale of the Christian missionary enterprise—that 'in none other is there salvation: for neither is there; any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.'

The Great Text Commentary.

PSALM CXVIII. 24.

**'This is the day which the Lord hath made;
We will rejoice and be glad in it.'**

THIS is unmistakably a Psalm for use in the Temple worship. It was probably meant to be sung antiphonally, on some day of national rejoicing (v.²⁴). A general concurrence of opinion points to the period of the Restoration from Babylon as its date, as in the case of many Psalms in this Book V., but different events connected with that restoration have been selected. The Psalm implies the completion of the Temple, and therefore shuts out any point prior to that. Delitzsch fixes on the dedication of the Temple as the occasion; but the most probable view is that which connects the Psalm with the great celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles recorded in Neh 8. In spite of the sneers of Sanballat and Tobiah, and the active hostility of the neighbouring tribes, the repair of the walls of Jerusalem had been successfully completed. The work was finished on the twenty-fifth day of the month Elul in the twenty-first year of Artaxerxes (444 B.C.). Nehemiah concludes his narrative with the words, 'And it came to pass, when all our enemies heard thereof, that all the heathen that were about us feared, and were much cast down in their own eyes: for they perceived that this work was wrought of our God' (6¹⁶). In the following month (Tisri) the Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated with exceptional rejoicings. 'There was exceeding great gladness' (Neh 8¹⁴⁻¹⁸). The triumphant joyousness of the Psalm, its thanksgivings for recent deliverance from the hostility of surrounding enemies, its vivid consciousness that this deliverance is due to Jehovah's help alone, correspond strikingly with the circumstances and feelings of that time, as they are delineated in the Book of Nehemiah. Baethgen, who is very slow to recognize indications of specific dates, speaks with unwonted decisiveness, when he writes, 'I believe that I can say with certainty that Psalm 118 was sung for the first time at the Feast of Tabernacles in the year 444 B.C.'

This Psalm was the thanksgiving or recessional hymn after the Passover, and was therefore sung by Christ and the

Apostles at the end of the Last Supper. It is most probably the hymn they sang on the way to the Mount of Olives.¹

I.

THE DAY.

'This is the day.'

1. The verse of the text is best regarded as the continuation of the choral praise in vv.^{22, 23}. 'The day' is that of the festival now in process, the joyful culmination of God's manifold deliverances. It is a day in which joy is duty, and no heart has a right to be too heavy to leap for gladness. Private sorrows enough many of the jubilant worshippers no doubt had, but the sight of the Stone laid as the Head of the corner should bring joy even to such.

It would be a true thought, and a right one, every day of the year, as you open your eyes, to feel it a new-born day for a new-born soul, calling to new attainments, and new works of love; and entering upon it with a determination to be happy, and saying, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.'²

2. But in our Lord's time the whole of the hundred and eighteenth Psalm was applied to the Messiah by the Jewish interpreters. Christ was the Stone, refused by the builders of Israel, but afterwards made the Head of the corner. His was the welcome, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord'; to Him was addressed the prayer, 'Hosanna, save, I pray,' as on Palm Sunday, by the Jewish multitude. Thus it was very natural for the Christian Church to find in the words, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it,' an application to our Lord Jesus Christ. What was the day in His Life which He made His own, beyond all others? Not His birthday; for that meant His entrance on a life of sorrows. Not His Ascension day; for that was the closing scene of a triumph already achieved. Not His Transfiguration day; it was a momentary flash of glory in a career of pain. Not the day of His Crucifixion; it was a great day for a ruined world, but for Him it marked the lowest stage of humiliation

¹ C. L. Marson, *The Psalms at Work*, 261.

² J. Vaughan.

and of woe. The Day of days in the life of Christ was the day of His Resurrection. It reflected new glory on the day of His Birth. It witnessed a triumph of which the Ascension was but a completion. It was to the Transfiguration what the sunrise is to the earliest dawn. It poured a flood of light and meaning on Calvary itself; and showed that what took place there was not simply the death-scene of an innocent Sufferer, but a Sacrifice which would have power with God to the end of time. Something of this kind is what was felt by the old Christians about Easter Day; and as it was the greatest day in the life of Jesus Christ, so for them it was the greatest day in the whole year. It was the day of days; it was the Lord's own day; it was the queen of festivals.

There is a little town called Feldkirch on the frontier of Austria, on the Ill, an affluent of the Rhine. It numbers under three thousand inhabitants. In the year 1799, when the armies of Napoleon were sweeping over the Continent, Massena, one of his generals, suddenly appeared on the heights above the town at the head of eighteen thousand men. It was Easter Day, and the morning sun as it rose glittered on the weapons of the French at the top of the range of hills to the west of Feldkirch. The town council hastily assembled to consult what was to be done. Defence was impossible. Should a deputation be sent to Massena with the keys of the town, and an entreaty that he should treat the place with mercy? Then the old Dean of the church stood up. 'It is Easter Day,' he said. 'We have been reckoning on our own strength, and that fails. It is the day of the Lord's Resurrection. Let us ring the bells and have services, as usual, and leave the matter in God's hands. We know only our own weakness, and not the power of God.' His words prevailed. Then from the three or four church towers in Feldkirch the bells began to clang in joyous peals in honour of the Resurrection, and the streets were filled with worshippers hastening to the House of God. The French heard with surprise and alarm the sudden clangour of joy-bells; and concluding that the Austrian army had arrived in the night to relieve the place, Massena suddenly broke up his camp, and before the bells had ceased ringing not a Frenchman was to be seen.¹

3. Again, we owe to the Resurrection of our Lord one of the most wide-spread and popular of Christian institutions—the Lord's Day, or 'Sunday,' as we generally call it. We cannot better describe Sunday than in the words of the Hebrew Psalmist, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made.' It is clear that these words cannot refer primarily to an institution which did not exist until centuries after they were written. Nor are they necessarily a direct prediction of it. But they give, perhaps,

¹ Baring-Gould.

the most accurate description of Sunday to be found in the Bible—a description all the more suggestive if it is undesigned. For there is no reason to think that the Lord's Day was instituted as in any sense a Christian Sabbath. It was from the very first a weekly memorial of the Resurrection, and its continued observance is the Church's abiding testimony to her belief in that supreme article of our Creed.

4. Easter Day is the parent of all days. For the Sunday is the mother of the week, and all the Sundays spring from this Sunday; and it would be well for us if we traced back all the days of the week to our Sundays, and all our Sundays to the Resurrection. They are to be congratulated who, when they wake every morning, receive life as a new creation, and take the day as something God has made especially for them.

It is a great criterion of a man's state how he meets the opening day,—whether his first thoughts are happy thoughts; whether the day rises gloomily on his mind, or whether it comes in speaking of peace, and love, and God, and happy duties, and pleasant things, for which that day is given. It is a great thing to have a resurrection, a joyful resurrection, every morning. Will not they have a blessed rising by and by from the sleep of death, who arise every morning as on the wing from the death of sleep?

Saint Simon, the famous courtier of Louis XIV., used to greet himself in the morning with these words, 'Get up, M. le Comte! you have great things to do to-day.'

So here hath been dawning
Another blue Day;
Think wilt thou let it
Slip useless away.

Out of Eternity
This new Day is born;
Into Eternity,
At night, will return.

Behold it aforetime
No eye ever did;
So soon it forever
From all eyes is hid.

Here hath been dawning
Another blue Day;
Think wilt thou let it
Slip useless away.²

² Thomas Carlyle.

II.

IT IS A DAY OF DIVINE VICTORY.

'Which the Lord hath made.'

It was a day of victory for Israel, a day of celebration due to the deliverance wrought by Jehovah.

1. It was a *victory over doubt*. There had been abundant faint-heartedness among even the restored exiles. The nations around had scoffed at these 'feeble Jews,' and the scoffs had not been without echoes in Israel itself. Chiefly the men of position and influence, who ought to have strengthened drooping courage, had been infected with the tendency to rate low the nation's power, and to think that their enterprise was destined to disaster. But now the Temple is built, and the worshippers stand in it. What does that teach but that all has been God's doing? So wonderful is it, so far beyond expectation, that the very objects of such marvellous intervention are amazed to find themselves where they stand. So rooted is our tendency to unbelief that, when God does what He has sworn to do, we are apt to be astonished with a wonder which reveals the greatness of our past incredulity. No man who trusts God ought to be surprised at God's answers to trust.

We are told that the sun is nearest to us in winter, when it seems farthest away: so I comfort myself with the thought that God is often closest to us when we are coldest and He is most invisible. There is much that we cannot explain, which we may never explain. The more we think, the harder are the problems. But I look for light to the Lamb on the Cross, and there I learn that God *is*, that God is Love, that God is Light. Do you say: 'Ah! but there are so few signs of the day; the clouds are so dark, men around us are groping and losing their way; worst of all we ourselves are not sure of the path?' It is only too true. For narrow is the gate, strait is the way, and few there be that find it. But John Bunyan, in his *Pilgrim's Progress*, has told us that even when we cannot see the way, we yet may see the Light of the Cross in the distance. 'Then said Evangelist, pointing with his finger over a very wide field, Do you see yonder wicket-gate? The man said, No. Then said the other, Do you see yonder shining light? He said, I think I do. Then said Evangelist, Keep that light in your eye.'¹

2. It was a *victory over the world*. Israel was but a feeble handful. Its very existence seemed to depend on the caprice of the protecting kings who had permitted its return. It had had bitter

experience of the unreliableness of a monarch's whim. Now, with superb reliance, which was felt by the Psalmist to be the true lesson of the immediate past, it peals out its choral confidence in Jehovah with a 'heroism of faith which may well put us to the blush.' Faith in Jehovah makes men independent of human helpers. Fear of and confidence in men are both removed by trust in God.

In the risen Christ have we the victory over the world. Let us only put off the world, and we put on Christ. As children say to themselves, 'This is the spring,' or 'This is the sea,' trying to grasp the thought, and not let it go; as travellers in a foreign land say, 'This is that great city,' or 'This is that famous building,' knowing it has a long history through centuries, and vexed with themselves that they know so little about it; so let us say, This is the Day of days, the Royal Day, the Lord's Day. Christ entered into His rest, and so do we. We have had enough of weariness and dreariness, and listlessness, and sorrow and remorse. We have had enough of this troublesome world. We have had enough of its noise and din. Noise is its best music. But now there is stillness; and it is a stillness that speaks. We know how strange the feeling is of perfect silence after continued sound. Such is our blessedness now. Calm and serene days have begun; and Christ is heard in them, and His still small voice, because the world speaks not.²

3 It was a *victory over circumstances*. The very life of Israel as a nation was threatened. The enemy thrust sore with intent to make Israel fall. But now the trials are recognized to be from Jehovah. It is He who has corrected, severely indeed, but still 'in measure, not to bring to nothing, but to make capable and recipient of fuller life.' It is beautiful that all thought of human foes has faded away, and God only is seen in all the sorrow.

If we have a fresh and vivid feeling of Christ's nearness, if His presence is to us a blessed reality, each day will be for us a day of victory over circumstances. Sickness, death, the loss of friends, the opposition of those who have no true faith in and love for Jesus Christ, the bad tempers, the prejudices, the follies of those around us, the troubles and heartaches of the natural life, remain as before. But they no longer absorb attention. The eye of the soul is turned upward; it is fixed on the Divine and the Eternal. These outward troubles still have their importance. But they are seen in their true proportions; they do not obscure the higher realities. They are not feared.

¹ Forbes Robinson, *College and Ordination Addresses*, 140.

² J. H. Newman.

In 1745, Louis Rang, the brother of a minister who only saved himself from the scaffold by flight, a young man of twenty-five years of age, and himself a minister of the Protestant religion, was arrested at Livron. He was thrown into prison at Valence, and condemned to die at Grenoble, March 2nd, 1745. In vain the President of the Court had offered him his life if he would abjure his faith. He had rejected all offers. His sentence was that he should be hung in the market-place at Dié, and that his head should be severed from his body and exposed on a gibbet opposite the little inn at Livron, where he had been arrested. On his way to the scaffold, he sang v.²⁴ of Ps 118. His voice was drowned by the roll of drums. With his eyes raised to heaven, he reached the foot of the scaffold, fell on his knees in prayer, then mounted the ladder and met his death.

A few weeks later, Jacques Roger, a venerable man of seventy years of age, forty of which he had spent as a Protestant pastor, was betrayed to the government and arrested. Ordained at Würtemberg, and therefore one of the few regularly ordained ministers, he had braved the law which made it a capital offence to return to France. For forty years he had escaped, often by a hair's breadth, the pursuit of the soldiers, who had tracked him like a wild beast. The officer in command asked him who he was. 'I am he,' he replied, 'whom you have sought for thirty-nine years; it was time that you should find me.' Condemned to death at Grenoble, he spent his last hours in encouraging some Protestant prisoners to be true to their faith. When the executioner and his assistants arrived to take him to the place of execution, he received the summons cheerfully, quoting the same verse which Louis Rang had sung on the scaffold (Ps 118²⁴).¹

III.

IT IS A DAY OF GLADNESS.

'We will rejoice and be glad in it.'

The Israelites 'leaped for joy'; they 'danced for joy' because of the victory that Jehovah had wrought. It was the manifestation of a gladness which filled and overflowed the whole being. Theirs was a joy that could not be restrained. Yet the 'day' in which unmingled gladness inspires our songs had not yet dawned, fair as were the many days which Jehovah had made. If sadness was ingratitude and almost treason then, what sorrow should now be so dense that it cannot be pierced by the Light which lighteth every man? The joy of the Lord should float, like oil on stormy waves, above our troublous sorrows, and smooth their tossing.

Our religion must be joyful because we have Christ with us, and therefore cannot choose but sing, as a lark cannot choose but carol. 'Religion has no power over us, but as it is our happiness,'

and we shall never make it our happiness, and therefore never know its beneficent control, until we lift it clean out of the low region of outward forms and joyless service, into the blessed heights of communion with Jesus Christ, 'whom having not seen we love.'

1. It was the *gladness of reaction*, a reaction from anxiety and sorrow, doubts and trials.

So it was at the time of Christ's Resurrection. The Apostles had been crushed by the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. They could not have imagined beforehand that One so popular, so powerful, so gifted, so good, would die like a malefactor amid the execrations of the populace, and be buried away out of sight. They had trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel. Their disappointment, their despondency, their anguish, were exactly proportioned to their earlier hopes, and, as is always the case in the life of feeling, one deep answered to another. When He was in His grave all seemed over, and when He appeared first to one and then to another on the day of His Resurrection they could not keep their feelings of welcome and delight, traversed though these were by a sense of wondering awe, within anything like bounds. 'Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.' Their joy at seeing Him corresponded to the agony which had preceded it. The rebound was proportioned to the recoil.

Our joy will sometimes be made sweeter and more wonderful by the very presence of the mourning and the grief. Just as the pillar of cloud, that glided before the Israelites through the wilderness, glowed into a pillar of fire as the darkness deepened, so, as the outlook around becomes less and less cheery and bright, and the night falls thicker and thicker, what seemed to be but a thin grey wavering column in the blaze of the sunlight will gather warmth and brightness at the heart of it when the midnight comes. You cannot see the stars at twelve o'clock in the day; you have to watch for the dark hours ere heaven is filled with glory. And so sorrow is often the occasion for the full revelation of the joy of Christ's presence.²

The very saddest man that ever lived was our Lord Jesus Christ; but that truth enfolds another—the very gladdest man that ever walked the earth was this same Jesus. This is not contradictory. The capacity for grief is the measure of the capacity for gladness. The depth is the height. He who never sinks never soars. The keen sensitiveness to sorrow is also and necessarily the keen sensitiveness, in every healthy soul, to joy. He who sank as no other did to darkest depths of sorrow, rose as no

¹ R. E. Prothero, *The Psalms in Human Life*, 225.

² A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*, 145.

other could to sunny heights of bliss. The tide that goes furthest out, leaving stretches of sand and shaggy rocks to be smitten by the fierce sun, is the tide that comes furthest in, sweeping with its force far up the coast, whilst it laughs and sings in its strength and fulness. The perfect human nature of our Lord, having every faculty developed perfectly, had this in its completeness—the *faculty of gladness*. Think of Adam standing upon the earth, the God-made man, with everything within him so attuned that every breath and influence of earth broke into music as it touched him and went up to heaven in praise. So stands the Second Adam, the sinless Man Christ Jesus, His life a perfect harmony; a soul whose every string responded perfectly to the touch of God's finger.¹

2. It was the gladness of a great *certainty of present blessing*. Jehovah had answered His people; they were standing again in His house; they were conscious of His favour. So the disciples were glad when they saw the Lord; not because they saw Him only, but because they knew He was with them. Their sight was an assurance of His presence, and so brought them joy.

Count up all sources of gladness;—there is none that can compare with the consciousness of God's favour. 'Thy favour is better than life.' When He saith, 'Well done, good and faithful servant,' we do enter into the joy of the Lord. As surely as the sunshine can chase away dull winter, and deck the earth with beauty, and cover once again the bare black trees with foliage, and fill the hedgerows with flowers, and give to the dull fields the rich promise of the harvest—so surely can the gracious shining of God's favour fill the soul with deepest peace and richest

joy. To walk hand in hand with Him is Paradise restored. Do we not all of us know what it is to feel the fever of our life rebuked; and as the burden of care falls from the shoulders, we rest in such a blessed sense of God's love to us that we wonder whether doubt or fear can ever find a cranny through which again to creep?

3. It was the gladness of *confidence for future service*. Israel would yet serve God, and draw the nations into the community of God's people. God had a work for His chosen people, and He deemed them fit to perform it.

The risen Christ calls us not only to begin a new life, but to go on with it, with renewed zeal and carefulness. Let us be of good courage. Day by day we shall find that our steps are not in vain; we shall find that we can do what we once thought impossible. We shall find that that way of serving God with a perfect heart, which seemed so difficult, becomes not only easy, but the very joy of our hearts.

To have the heart to do a great good and the power is the fulfilling of our joy. Conscious fitness for the work that God has appointed us means a great joy in it. What a man can do well he can do easily, says Ruskin; and what he can do well, he does gladly. He is no true and healthy worker who does not find in his work a joy, an inspiration, a triumph.

Give me to sleep, give me to wake
Girded and shod, and bid me play
The hero in the coming day.²

¹ Mark Guy Pearse, *Short Talks for the Times*, 226.

² R. L. Stevenson.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

The Second Part.

It is not proposed to discuss the Second Part of the *Pilgrim's Progress* in anything like the same fulness with which the First Part was treated. This and the following articles are mere sketches, with suggestions for study, and notes upon such parts of the allegory as are new in this part.

The *sequel* is, and must always be, an all but irresistible temptation to writers whose books have sprung from living imagination. Nothing in our literary history is more natural, or more touching, than the tears which Charles Dickens shed at the

death of Little Nell; and the parting with the children of one's imagination must be like the breaking up of an old home. Yet, with some notable exceptions, such continuations are seldom as successful as the original story. Dumas and Thackeray have perhaps been more fortunate in their sequels than most writers, and Hugo's great Trilogy, while the characters are different in each of its parts, has attained a completeness of guiding principle which sets it apart by itself. On the other hand, Meredith has found few who love his

second parts as well as his first, and George MacDonald probably none. The most successful plan would seem to be that of those writers who, like Shakespeare and many others, introduce old characters which they feel they have not exhausted, singly into quite new stories and surroundings.

As to Bunyan's great story, opinions have always differed as to the merits of the Second Part. The usual verdict is probably on the whole unfavourable,¹ although H. C. Benson, in his chapter on the book in *Beside Still Waters*, has made himself the enthusiastic champion of Christiana and her fortunes. And, indeed, if any story ever needed a continuation, it was this. The exigencies of the allegory required Christian to leave his home, but the forsaken wife and family have to be reckoned with. We have already seen how groundless are the accusations of selfishness in the religion which thus leaves all to follow Christ. But the recurring mention of the family left behind in the City of Destruction, has already whetted our curiosity as to their ultimate career,² and at the close of the earlier part there is a virtual promise of more to follow.

Bunyan himself, at least, opens his sequel with no false modesty. The telling of the former dream, he says, was 'pleasant to me and profitable to you,' and he proceeds to explain, in the most business-like fashion, that 'through the multiplicity of business,' he has been 'kept back from his wonted travels into those parts,' but now, 'having had some concerns that way of late, I went down again thitherward.' As a matter of fact, his first idea was 'to complete the picture by a contrast.' Two years after the publication of Part I., and immediately after its third edition had appeared, he began *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman*,³ with that intent. But Mr. Badman could be no proper sequel to the tale of Christian, and indeed, like a kind of Frankenstein's monster, he may well have terrified even his creator. At all events, he did not satisfy him, and Christiana was still upon his heart and remembrance. He had hesitated about publishing the first part, and had consulted his friends, with varying result. 'Some said, John, print it; others said, Not so!' Still more varied, and not less frank, were the opinions of his friends as to the publishing of a sequel. But John Bunyan,

though he much valued the advice of friends, yet was one of those who in the end must rely upon his own judgment. The first part had immediate and enormous success, and in three years ran into seven editions. But it was not till 1684, six years after the former publication, that the second part appeared. In this interval he had written (besides *Mr. Badman*) *The Fear of God, Come and Welcome to Jesus Christ*, and *The Holy War*. They were six busy years, for at that time John Bunyan was the most popular preacher in England, and he was engaged in much pastoral work besides.

From what has been already stated, certain points of contrast are already manifest. The first part was written in prison, the second in freedom. The first had leisure about it for meditation, while the second was the product of intervals in an excessively busy life. The first is more spontaneous, upon the simple impulse of the author, while the second, being written after criticism and suggestion, such as are described in the Author's Apology to it, is more or less avowedly supplementary to the former part. The first part is, accordingly, the more natural, while the second, being more ambitious as literature, and so more conscious, is distinctly less valuable for those rare literary qualities which have made the first part so famous. On the whole, Part II. is more stately and religious, but it is less natural and human. One often feels that the writer was under the necessity of getting something more to say, and as there was nothing really lacking, he had to invent such novelties as the perfumed and gold-lettered epistle sent from the King to Christiana—a kind of addition more in the style of Part III. than of John Bunyan, and altogether irrelevant in the story of these pilgrims.

The Story.

The story begins with a dream, this time in a wood about a mile off the *den* of the former dream, a touch of narration done in the exact fashion of the old *Chansons*. A new figure, Mr. Sagacity, appears, and begins the tale with an epitome of Christian's adventures, for which service doubtless he was invented. Christiana⁴ is introduced in her loneliness, troubled both by remorse for her treatment of her husband, and by anxiety for her own soul. She, too, like her husband, is disturbed by visions of the night. First she dreams of that

¹ Cf. Kerr Bain and Froude on this question.

² E.g. Charity in the House Beautiful, etc.

³ Cf. Brown, *John Bunyan*, ii. 23, 25.

⁴ Brown, *John Bunyan*, ii. 28.

parchment on which the deeds of the past are recorded; then of devils, plotting to tempt her with the world away from her serious thought, and then of Christian in heaven upon that same 'paved work of a sapphire,' which Browning has described in his *One Word More*. It is an interesting and characteristic sidenote of Bunyan's to the passage about the devils, 'Mark this, this is the quintessence of hell.'

Then follows the visit of the heavenly messenger Secret, and the mother and children resolve to start on pilgrimage. Neighbours visit her—young Mercy, and Mrs. Timorous, daughter of the man whom Christian met on the Hill Difficulty. The expected conversation follows, in which Mrs. Timorous dilates upon the horrors of the journey, quotes Obstinate and Pliable as wise men (though we know how Pliable was regarded in the city after his return), and concludes by an appeal to the thought of the 'four sweet babes.' Christiana's answer is an argument which such a neighbour may be supposed to understand, showing that the pilgrimage will pay, in spite of all its dangers. Mercy, who has been silent, is resolved to have more talk with Christiana, and to go with her 'if she find truth and life' in what she hears. Mrs. Timorous is lost sight of in a gossiping party, whose talk is rapidly becoming indecent; and Mercy, with much hesitation or self-distrust, consents to go as Christiana's servant as far as the Wicket Gate, and to decide as to further pilgrimage by her reception there. So they all set out, Mercy weeping because of the condition in which she must leave her relations, but singing some very sweet and simple verses as she goes. At the Slough of Despond they manage to find the steps, and cross safely, though in a somewhat slippery and precarious fashion. At the Wicket Gate they knock for a long time, being answered only by the savage barking of the dog, which is explained in a sidenote as 'the devil, an enemy to prayer.' Mercy has longer to wait than the rest, but at length, after Christiana's prayer for her, and her own desperate knock and swooning, she is admitted, and restored by a restorative bundle of myrrh. At the Wicket Gate they see a distant view of the Cross, and so pass on. As they pass the devil's garden, the boys pluck some fruit from the overhanging branches of trees, and persist in so doing in spite of their mother's

chiding. There follows the incident of the assault of two Ill-favoured Ones who are the same that Christiana had seen and heard in her dream, previous to the journey. The Reliever comes in answer to their crying out, and delivers them, upon which they learn that they should have asked for a conductor. The design of this part of the story seems to be to enforce the danger of that part of the journey nearest to conversion. The devil seems to be everywhere about the region, with his castle and sharpshooters, his garden, his dog, and his ill-favoured ones. The pilgrims accordingly here fall into their first blunders and learn their earliest lessons of experience.

The Allegory.

It will be seen, in this opening section, that there is a certain new elaboration, and a want of that simple spontaneity which is so characteristic of the earlier story. Mr. Sagacity is an unnecessary and altogether conventional figure. Dr. Brown recalls the similar introductory speaker in the Prologues of Euripides.¹ It is a device common in the old Romances, which seem never able to get begun, on account of the 'legend about the legend,' as Pater aptly calls this preliminary part. Bunyan evidently feels this, and, finding that Mr. Sagacity must be got rid of, dismisses him rather clumsily just before they come to the Wicket Gate. We are not sorry to part with him, for he has so drawn the allegory in among the romances as to exaggerate the defects of the former part, especially in his spectacular account of Christian in the Celestial City.

Yet in the main the people speak with that old crisp forthrightness which has grown so familiar and so charming to readers of the first part. The City of Destruction is 'a populous place, but possessed with a very ill-conditioned and idle sort of people.' 'Better and better, quoth I. But what! wife and children and all?' Many instances of the same raciness and vitality of interest might be quoted. And the incidents impress us in the same way as formerly with the sense that he who describes them is writing from the memory of what he has actually seen with his eyes. The ill-favoured ones meet the pilgrims 'when they were gone *about two bow shots* from the place,' and so on.

¹ John Bunyan, xi.

Allegorical writing is apt to become childish and unreal,¹ and it is a curious weapon in the hands of this great strong plain man. It is mingled with touches of the writer's personal history. He has a multiplicity of business which compels him to take up his lodgings here and there. The determination to link in the second with the first part is manifest, not in the general story alone, but in the introduction of such already familiar personages as the Timorous family and Madame Wanton. The introduction of new matter is apt to be grotesque, as in the perfumed letter of Secret, and the trumpeter, introduced without any apparent reason, at the Wicket Gate. The allegory is also somewhat more conventional in form, as we have seen from the introduction of Mr. Sagacity, and from the dream in the wood. The devil-dog is another instance of this, and recalls the widespread convention which finds its most popular instance in the hound of Goethe's *Faust*. The veil between the allegorical and the spiritual, too, is thinner. Such sentences as 'The King delighteth in Mercy,' 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' and 'Damsel, I bid thee arise' are examples of that breaking through of the meaning which R. L. Stevenson has discussed so excellently from the literary point of view in his essay on Bunyan.

The Character-Drawing.

All the psychological and human work is memorable. There are traces of what would now be considered a somewhat superior and discourteous estimate of women, but there is abundant compensation in the delicate touches which reveal the eternal feminine. New and clever phrases, and a fresh vivacity and interest, light up the conversations continually. Mercy, for instance, parting with Mrs. Timorous, 'thinks to walk this sunshiny morning a little with Christiana, to help her on her way'; and Christiana is 'glad at her heart, not only that she had a companion, but also for that she had prevailed with this poor maid to fall in love with her own salvation.' Each of the characters is distinct, and is consistently sustained throughout.

Mr. Sagacity, so long as he lasts, is true to his name. His breezy account of the fame which Christian had won even in Destruction, is quite in keeping with the popular mind, whose love of

praise he knows. It is as if he said, 'You who love praise, why choose the momentary and neglect the lasting good opinion even of the world?' One remembers in this connexion Bunyan's own statement, 'When I went out to seek the Bread of Life, some of them would follow me, and the rest be put into a muse at home. Yea, almost all the town at first would go out to hear at the place where I found good.'²

Mrs. Timorous is equally distinct. 'I knocked, as you know is our custom'—a very proper lady, whose only conscience, indeed, is her propriety. Yet the moral value of such timorous propriety is pitilessly exposed immediately. This book is one long protest against fear, and at this point we see it exposed in its twofold temptation of loneliness and the unknown; and in its contemptible refuge of respectability.

The children are, at first, naturally keen for the journey; and their early piety will run some risk of landing them in priggishness. But the author knows this quite well, and, to our great relief, makes them eat the tempting fruit, and go on eating it after their mother's remonstrance. There is plenty of hope that these boys will prove good company after all.

Mercy is, from first to last, an admirably imagined character. She is against the journey at first, and no wonder, considering its danger to her friends. Even in Destruction she was true to her name, but uneducated Mercy is always a sad blunderer. Natural kindness needs to be converted to a nobler mercy. In the company of the regular pilgrims she feels herself something of an alien, and her self-distrust is finely blended with her pity for the relations she is leaving behind. There is something peculiarly tender and affecting in this gentle modesty. 'Had I as good ground to hope for a loving reception at the gate as you, I think no Slough of Despond would discourage me.' The saying reminds us of the eternal pathos of Virgil's words to Dante in the *Purgatorio*.³

Christiana is already a notable woman, of firmly drawn character and many-sided human interest. She had despised her husband and treated him atrociously while she had him, but the empty chair is wonderfully eloquent, so that even the uncouth language and behaviour of one whose sincerity we despised, become an intolerable reproach after our

¹ Cf. Snell, *The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 34, 117.

² Cf. Brown, *John Bunyan*, chap. vi.

³ Cantos vii., xxvii., xxx.

chance is gone. Christiana, at this stage, does not understand the language of heaven, and yet feels its beauty. But a letter of personal invitation comes to her: and she would need it, after her past conduct. Her heart, like every Christian heart, echoes the fear:

So vile I am, how dare I hope to stand,
In the pure glory of that holy land?

She desires to go, though she knows it will be no easy passage; nor has she any thought of being 'carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease.' From the first, she reckons with the hardships of pilgrimage, and will have it on the same terms as her husband. There is in her a touch of the Rationalist, strong in intellect rather than sweet in affections like Mercy. She cannot but question why the Man at the Wicket Gate keeps such a dog; and again, after the incident of the Ill-favoured Ones, she wonders, 'since our Lord knew it would be for our profit that He sent not one along with us.' Altogether this is a strong-minded woman who thinks for herself and takes life strenuously. What the Ill-favoured Ones stand for—unless they may be memories of some wilder days of her youth—we cannot well say. Certainly her temptations will not usually be towards sins of frailty, though sins of harshness and self-will may have some troubles in store for her.

The Religious Teaching.

There is the ominous background of Judgment and Retribution, and the sense of enemies, here as formerly. To begin with, 'The King will know the reason . . . why Christian's neighbours set so little by him,' to which Bunyan adds the sidenote, 'Christian's King will take Christian's part.' All men are accountable for the treatment they give to true souls, and when the incident is closed, the matter is not yet over. When a sincere pilgrim has dwelt in any neighbourhood, his neighbours will sooner or later have to answer for it whether they made it easier or more difficult for him to live there. Again, there is a protest against false comforters in the statement that at the Slough there are 'Many that pretend to be the King's labourers, and that say they are for mending the King's Highway, that bring dirt and dung instead of stones, and so mar instead of mending.'¹ Finally, there is the unaccountable dog, and the

questions that his presence awakens. It is the old question, 'Why does not God kill Satan?' which has exercised the minds of old and young through so many generations. The German story of the answer, 'From love to thee, my child,' is beautiful, but it leaves the mystery unsolved. And so must Bunyan. 'The dog has another owner' is all the solution he attempts, leaving the conflicting forces of good and evil to their essential and inscrutable mystery. Yet he adds one word. All this unstable balance of power is but for a time, and, through evil and good both, God is working out His purpose. 'I take all at present patiently,' says the Man at the Gate.² A Syrian Christian, describing some years ago the injustice of the Mohammedan rule, added, with an access of eagerness, 'But God waits!' It is an assurance which frequently comforted the Psalmists.

The reality of spiritual experience is finely taught by the visit of Secret and the Wicket Gate. Secret, the name and the messenger both, is a touch of genius. At such a time, when the purposes and destinies alike are in equipoise, something is needed (in Professor William James' memorable phrase) to 'tilt the plane'³ towards good. We believe that there is spiritual backing for all our good impulses and desires, and at such a moment it is of supreme importance that we should be made aware of that help from on high. Whether such a sense of support be regarded as the work of some angel visitor, or of the Holy Spirit of God Himself, is of little moment, so long as the reinforcement is experienced, and our feet are set in the way of peace. The Wicket Gate is, as in Christian's case, the point of outward crisis, dividing the past from the future in one clearly defined choice, backed again by a divine act of reception. Mercy is wise in staking all her fortunes on the one point of her admission at that gate. The reception there is slightly elaborated from the simplicity of Christian's experience, probably with a view to clear up any doubt that the former story may have left in the minds of readers as to the relation between the Gate and the Cross. The separation between the two had probably given rise to criticism, and here the problem is solved by the device of Good-will's having the pilgrims to the top of the gate, and showing them the Cross further on the road. 'I grant pardon,' said he, 'by

² Cf. Benson, *Beside Still Waters*, s.l.

³ *The Will to Believe*.

¹ Cf. Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Celestial Railroad*, sub loco.

word and deed.' The words are at the gate, the deed was on the Cross. Mercy has to knock longer and more vehemently than her friend, since she has not received the same sense of personal invitation as Christiana. Yet it is worth while to knock there for a lifetime, for the alternative is to turn back. Here, as before, that is the great sin,—a fundamental note of the whole *Pilgrim's Progress*. In the incident of the deliverance from the Ill-favoured Ones, the pilgrims are not allowed to go back even to confess their mistake and ask for a conductor: and, indeed, of them as truly as of Christian, it is true, 'Go back they durst not.' But Mercy learns yet another lesson. Not only is going back forbidden. Lying prone is also wrong. She is told to arise, and when she pleads her faintness, she receives the answer, 'Fear not, but stand upon thy feet.'¹ It is to the erect in spirit, who dare to take life and all it may bring standing, that all gates open in the end. There follows a passage whose beauty is equalled by its breadth of Christian charity, and which is one of Bunyan's richest gems: 'And if there is any grace or forgiveness to spare, I beseech that I, thy poor handmaid, may be partaker thereof. Then he took her again by the hand, and led her gently in, and said, I pray for all them that believe on me, by what means soever they come unto me.' There is no possibility of mistaking the personality of this speaker. The words have in them all the breadth of human nature and divine love that mankind has found in Jesus Christ. And they are spoken to one who, hitherto, has had no personal assurance of her welcome there. Not on such assurances, but on the fact of knocking and the heart of Christ, does our acceptance at the gate depend.

There is much teaching about prayer in this passage. Outside the gate 'they betook themselves to a short debate about how they must manage their calling at the gate,' and the sidenote tells us that 'Prayer should be made with consideration.' It is well to remember that we should think before we pray, for that will save us from

¹ Cf. Ezk 2¹.

many disappointments, and not a little bewilderment as to whether prayer is answered. Yet when it comes to the act of prayer itself, we cannot, by prayers borrowed from others, hope to prevail. One of the remarkable passages in *Down in Water Street*, the story of the Jerry Macaulay Mission in New York, is that in which the penitent asks the Christian worker to pray for him, and is told 'You must pray for yourself.' So here, Christiana begins her intercession for Mercy, but is interrupted by Mercy's own knocking. It is a principle of the most vital truth in all such circumstances. Later on, in the bold and curious conversation between Christiana and the Reliever, as to the absence of a conductor, it appears that the Lord had in kindness suffered them to be without a conductor that they might learn both the need and the use of prayer,—'Tis a poor thing that is not worth asking for.' And so, here as so often elsewhere, 'There is some soul of goodness in things evil'; and the incident ends in a most pleasant optimism as to the lessons which may be derived even from our blunders, and the blessings that may eventually come to us along the dark and sordid pathway of our sins. The Reliever is a bright figure, undefined and difficult to identify, but carrying with him an atmosphere of hopefulness and a sense of well-being. He reminds us more of Help, to whom Christian was indebted at the Slough, than of any other figure. But the habit of making the best of existing circumstances, and looking on the bright side of experience, is native to Christiana. 'Now we are in, we are in, and I am glad with all my heart,' she says, after the adventure of the dog. It was Formalist and Hypocrisy from whom on the last occasion we heard these words, 'If we are in, we are in.' But there is all the difference in the world between the two optimisms. Theirs is but the result of desire to believe themselves safe; hers is that of one who knows her salvation. You cannot reconstruct the universe and pronounce it 'all very good'; but you can get God to reconstruct your soul, and then the universe somehow comes right.

Literature.

ROBERTSON AND PLUMMER ON FIRST CORINTHIANS.¹

LIKE Romans, First Corinthians appears in the 'International Critical Commentary' under a double editorship. The difficulties of this method are almost as obvious as its drawbacks. Still, when each author accepts general responsibility for the work, the requisite unity of impression is preserved. As a matter of fact, it is only here and there (*e.g.* on page xxviii) that readers of the present volume have any indication of who is the particular contributor. Both have done a piece of conscientious and careful exegesis, which needed to be done. Since Professor Findlay's edition in the Expositor's Greek Testament we have had no English work on the Greek text of the Epistle which would put students abreast of the relevant problems, or, at any rate, make them aware of such problems. This edition fills the gap usefully, and English readers now possess notes on the Epistle which aim at serving them as the notes of Heinrici, J. Weiss, and Bachmann serve the present generation of German students.

The fashion of commentaries alters wonderfully little, but one must single out the paraphrastic translations prefixed to each section of the Epistle by our editors as a feature of real excellence. It is a distinct help to have such paraphrases. Only, it is not often that they are a success. Lightfoot sowed the seed; but while his imitators have been numerous, they have not found it so easy to raise the flower as perhaps they imagined. Bishop Robertson and Dr. Plummer have achieved much better results than the large majority of other editors in this line of business; they are entitled to special praise for the qualities of suggestiveness and adequacy which their introductory sections frequently exhibit.

A second characteristic of the edition is the attention paid to what may be called questions of Christian doctrine. First Corinthians, brings out Paul's practical judgment more than almost any-

thing else. As the editors admit, it is not a doctrinal treatise like Romans; 'nor is it, like Galatians, the document of a crisis involving far-reaching doctrinal consequences. It deals with the practical questions affecting the life of a Church founded by the writer: one great doctrinal issue, arising out of circumstances at Corinth (xv. 12), is directly treated; but doctrine is, generally speaking, implied or referred to rather than enforced. Yet, none the less, the doctrinal importance and instructiveness of the letter can hardly be over-rated.' The notes repeatedly present materials for the discussion of such doctrinal issues in the light of modern Christianity, even at places where real problems of Paulinism almost demand prior notice. Naturally one of the most prominent issues which reveal the dogmatic basis underneath Paul's practical judgment, is that of the Lord's Supper. It is handled with sensible moderation. Thus the editors properly decline to interpret 11³⁰ of spiritual deadness. On the other hand, they are less convincing now and then, as, *e.g.*, in their refusal to see an allusion to some practice of vicarious baptism in 15²⁹. They incline to follow Professor Findlay in making οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν refer to persons who became Christians in the first instance out of affection for their beloved dead, *i.e.* to survivors who got baptized in hope of securing a reunion with departed Christian friends who 'had died, earnestly desiring and praying "for their conversion." This is ingenious, but is it natural, from the standpoint of exegesis? Surely the evidence for vicarious baptism or ritual in the Greek cults, though slight, is sufficient to justify the hypothesis of an allusion to some local adaptation of it by Corinthians desirous of safeguarding the eternal welfare of friends and relatives who had died in paganism.

Another decision which is even more surprising, is the refusal to recognize demonic powers in the ἀρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου of 2⁶. No other interpretation fits in naturally to the language of the paragraph, and the expression in v.⁸ is far from excluding it, especially in the light of the well-known passage from the *Ascensio Isaiae*—which, by the way, is not unlikely to be the source of the citation in 2⁹, despite what is said on pp. 41-42. This is, in fact, one of the places where one misses

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.* By the Right Rev. Archibald Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Exeter, and the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. Price 12s. Pp. lxx, 424.

a reference to works like those of Everling and Dibelius upon the distinct significance of spirits, good and evil, in the Pauline cosmology; just as the general attitude to Paulinism suffers more than once from a failure to take account of authorities like Titius, Sokolowski, and Gunkel. Similarly, the discussion on the parties in the Church at Corinth would have been more satisfactory, from a critical point of view, if it had come to terms with the questions which have been ventilated in the recent essays by Rohr and Lütgert. From two Oxford editors we might also—though this is a detail—have expected a reference, on 9²⁴⁻²⁵, to the striking paragraph about the corruptible crown in Pater's *Plato and Platonism* (p. 233).

However, as Dr. Johnson argued, 'it is impossible for an expositor not to write too little for some, and too much for others.' This volume, at any rate, is characterized by the same careful attention to the minutiae of textual criticism and the interests of historical exegesis in general as the edition of *Romans* in the International Commentary. It is also admirably indexed. What it does contain is both orderly and accessible.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Broughty Ferry.

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh volumes of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge; 9s. net each) have now been issued. The seventh volume completes the Caroline Age. The rest of the ground is to be covered in seven further volumes, making altogether a total of fourteen volumes.

In a scheme of this magnitude ample scope is given for a very complete study of English literary history. Each article is, moreover, an individual and painstaking effort to combine fulness of detail and accuracy of perspective. The difficulties of specialization have been avoided and its merits retained. In the fifth volume, for example, we find six contributors engaged on the study of the English Drama. The result of these individual efforts is not only a full but also a well-balanced account of its rise and growth. There is no glaring distortion. It is a complete picture; not a succession of bright patches.

Is there any subject in dealing with which a student is more handicapped than this subject of

the English Drama? And what is the reason? The chief reason is that he is under the necessity of applying to various books for information, instead of having it before him in clearness and at the same time sufficient fulness as in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. But apart from their value for the student, these chapters are also very good reading.

The sixth and seventh volumes carry us to the end of the Caroline Age, and include the life and work of the principal dramatists down to 1642.

In his chapter on the Sacred Poets (vol. vii.), the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson has given us a remarkably complete survey of the work of this new school which developed in the Anglican Church in the second quarter of the seventeenth century. The first of these poets is Herbert. Mr. Hutchinson tells us just what it is most important for us to know of Herbert's life: where he was born; how educated; what influences led him at last to the Church, and the part that his final decision played in directing his genius into a new channel. Mr. Hutchinson discusses briefly a few of Herbert's outstanding poems, noting the defects which Herbert shared in common with the poets of the Metaphysical School. In this connexion we expected some reference to the influence of Donne on Herbert's work. For, in addition to being linked, as Mr. Hutchinson says, to his immediate contemporaries, Crashaw and Vaughan, Herbert is also connected, and as definitely, with his predecessor Donne. In his art he is a pupil of Donne. He reveals quite unmistakably the stamp of Donne's great personality and idiosyncrasies. In his extravagances Herbert is, so to speak, working after a pattern, and though he attains frequently a certain quaintness, as opposed to the repulsive distortion of some of Donne's work, yet he never reaches the passion which belongs to Donne.

Crashaw is a particularly interesting study. Mr. Hutchinson does full justice to his opportunity. To a certain extent Herbert is Jacobean in form and figure. Crashaw is most certainly Caroline. Says Mr. Hutchinson: 'There is hardly a poem by Crashaw which recalls Herbert, and the two men are widely different in temperament and genius. Crashaw's debt to the older poet is not so much technical as spiritual.' Crashaw's is a much more ardent temperament. He lacks the balance and variety of Herbert, but he has a lighter and more delicate fancy.

The same taste for symbolism, but in rather a different direction, is found in the work of Vaughan. He seeks the expression of his religious feeling in a way that anticipates Wordsworth. 'Another link with Wordsworth,' says Mr. Hutchinson, 'is Vaughan's intimate and religious feeling for nature. He has an open-air love for all natural sights and sounds, and a subtle sympathy even with the fallen timber or the stones at his feet.' He is happier away from the world of men, and can rejoice equally in

Dear Night ! this world's defeat, the stop to busy
fools,

and in the stir that heralds the dawn. It is in his observation of nature that he achieves his most felicitous epithets—"the unthrift sun," "the pury clouds," and "purling corn." The setting of these natural descriptions is usually religious, as in *The Rainbow* or *The Dawning*; but the lover of nature is as apparent as the mystical thinker.' He finds in nature an adequate symbolism, and a satisfying creed.

These are the outstanding figures of this new school. Of lesser followers Mr. Hutchinson mentions three—Traherne, Habington, and Quarles,—and concludes his chapter with a brief notice of their position in this great movement.

Professor Saintsbury has three chapters in this volume. One of them is on Milton. It is such a chapter as students delight in—cleverly put together and pleasant to read; yet close packed, with all the material necessary for study, but without any superfluous details. There is also a chapter on Bunyan by Dr. Brown. It occupies only about six pages. But Dr. Brown has put a life's experience into these pages. His chapter is one of the best in the volume.

EDWARD HASTINGS.

A DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY.

Dr. Henry Wace, now Dean of Canterbury, has lived to see the issue, in a single volume, of an abridged edition of the great *Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature* of which Sir William Smith and he were the original editors. He has not only lived to see its issue, but he has evidently had a considerable share in the preparation of it. For he writes the preface and his

name stands on the title-page along with that of the Rev. W. C. Piercy, M.A. It is a handsome and an attractive volume of more than a thousand pages (Murray; 21s. net).

What is the nature of the abridgment? In the first place, two centuries are clean cut off. These two centuries have been cut off because, 'although they are of immense interest in the history of the Church, as including the origins of the Teutonic civilization of Europe, they have not an equal interest with the first six as exhibiting primitive Christianity in its purer forms. With the one important exception of John of Damascus, the Fathers of the Church, so called, alike in East and West, fall within the first six centuries, and in the West the series is closed by St. Gregory the Great, who died in the year 604. English divines accordingly, since the days of Bishop Jewel, have, like Bishop Cosin, appealed to the first six centuries of the Church as exhibiting, in doctrine as well as in practice, subject to Holy Scripture, the standards of primitive Christianity. Those six centuries, consequently, have a special interest for all Christian students, and particularly for those of our own Church, and deserve accordingly some special treatment.' Those are the editor's words.

But this is not all. An almost innumerable number of insignificant names have been dropped. How drastic the lopping has been in this respect may be seen in this way. The original four-volume Dictionary contains, we are told, 596 Johns. This Dictionary contains 18. And it may be said at once that, except for the purpose of mere historical reference, this Dictionary is in that respect very much the better of the two.

The great articles are retained with but little abbreviation. And that also is wisely done. Many of the authors are gone; some of those that are alive, such as the Rev. E. B. Birks, have re-read and revised their articles. New articles have been supplied. In particular the Bishop of Exeter has substituted for Pressensé's sketch of St. Augustine, a study of that great Father similar in its thoroughness to Westcott's article on Origen and Lightfoot's on Eusebius.

It is a pity that it was not found possible to retain more of the bibliographies. In all dictionary work a bibliography, selected but sufficient, rigidly revised and brought up to date, is indispensable. A good deal, however, has been done to draw

attention to the more important literature that has appeared since the issue of the original work.

We have not yet had time to test the accuracy of the work, although we know that half the value of the book depends upon that. We are content at present to let the editors' previous record speak for itself. Only one word of criticism. A summary of such an article as that on Origen, placed at the beginning of the article, would have been of immense service.

HORAE SEMITICAE.

The fifth, six, and seventh volumes of *Horae Semiticae* are occupied with 'The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv,' who was Bishop of Hadatha about 850 A.D. The commentaries are edited and translated by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, Hon. D.D.(Heidelberg), LL.D.(St. Andrews), M.R.A.S., and they are introduced by James Rendel Harris, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D. Volume I. contains the translation (6s. net); volume II. contains Matthew and Mark in Syriac (10s. 6d. net); and volume III. contains Luke and John in Syriac (10s. 6d. net). They are published at the Cambridge University Press.

Now it is necessary, first of all, to say that by the issue of these three handsome volumes Mrs. Gibson has proved that she belongs to the very select band of women who are great scholars. Dr. Rendel Harris confesses that he himself shrank from even a small part of the undertaking which she has accomplished, and he speaks with admiration of Mrs. Gibson's courage in attacking a work so extended and beset by so many internal difficulties.

Of the person of Isho'dad or of the worth of his exposition we need not speak. The little that is known of the man himself will be found set forth in Dr. Rendel Harris's Introduction. The commentary itself will be read with much amazement. At first it seems to be all about words. The most innocent preposition is squeezed and twisted and tortured, just as by the Inquisition, not to make it tell the truth, but to make it say what the inquisitor wants it to say. But read on. There is here a flash of real insight; there a prayer of fervent devotion. What seemed at first likely to turn one's head or bring on second childhood prematurely, proves to be true, though unfamiliar, acquaintance with the mind of God.

THE ICE AGE.

Dr. G. Frederick Wright is the author of *The Ice Age in North America* (Higham; 20s. net). Dr. Wright is not a man of science pure and simple; he is also a man of theology. Is he the worse for that? On the contrary, it is the business of every man of science to know all that can be known of God and of man's relation to God. He is less a man the less a theologian he is; and being less a man he is less a man of science. He may compel his science to conform to his theology. Ah, that is another matter. Then he is neither a theologian nor a man of science. Just as theology must take in all the facts, physical, mental, spiritual, if it is to be a reliable theology, so must science take in all the facts, spiritual, mental, material, if it is to be reliable science.

Therefore it makes nothing against Dr. Wright, but everything for him that he is a diligent student of the Bible, and that the Book of Genesis has been present to his thought throughout the writing of this volume. The subject is presented by itself. There is no intrusion of the Bible or theology. It is the book of a firm believer in God and in the inspiration of that book which Dr. Wright would not be ashamed to call the Word of God; but for all that the student can see that the Geology is Geology, sound and authoritative.

'Dr. Wright has the gift of style. His particular place in the sects among which geologists are distributed does not greatly concern us. What concerns us is the ability with which he advocates his conclusions and the interest which he throws round all that he writes.

It is a great book. And it has been printed and published in a way that is worthy of its greatness. The maps and plans and photographs are produced in the most careful and finished manner.

It is unusual for an author to be able to say that his book has been read in proof by his publisher. But the publisher of the Rev. C. F. Hunter's book, *What a Christian Believes and Why* (2s.), is the Rev. J. Williams Butcher, Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Department; and Mr. Butcher is a theologian as well as a publisher. His hand is seen, not in the matter of the book only, but also in the effective manner in which it has been printed.

It is a manual of divinity for Sunday School Teachers and the like, to whom order and emphasis are essential. There is perfect order here, and the important is at a glance seen to be more than the unimportant, so skilfully are the paragraphs arranged and so freely is variety of type employed. As for the author, it is enough to say that Mr. Hunter has written a book which should be named at once whenever you are consulted as to 'the best introduction to the study of theology.'

The tenth volume of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net) begins with REUSCH and ends with SON OF GOD, and these articles are almost identical in length. For the strength of the book is its biography. The greatest space in this volume, however, is given to the subject of Roman Catholicism. The German work on which this is based is distinctly confined to Protestantism. That word is not found in the title-page of the new Schaff-Herzog, but it is none the less Protestant theology that is its scope. Accordingly it was inevitable that when the word 'Roman' was reached considerable space would have to be occupied.

First of all, Philip Schaff's general article in the first edition is revised by his son, Professor D. S. Schaff, and republished. Next, Kattenbusch's article in Hauck on the Roman Catholic Church outside the United States is condensed. Then Professor Charles H. McCarthy, of the Catholic University in Washington, writes an article on Roman Catholicism in America. This ends the general subject. But a series of articles follow on related subjects—Roman Catholic Eucharistic Congresses, Roman Catholic Parochial Schools, Roman Catholic Position on the Bible in the Public Schools, and Roman Catholic Restriction of Bible Reading by the Laity.

The literatures are the most valuable of the contents of this volume as of all the others. The literature added to the history of Roman Catholicism fills five closely printed small-type columns.

There seems to be a tendency in the later volumes to give less and less space to purely Biblical topics. That is right. This book cannot compete with the great Bible Dictionaries, and its space is only wasted by the inclusion of long Biblical articles.

There is no subject that people will listen to more readily than the history of hymns—at least as a relaxation from listening to sermons. It touches three sides of some people's nature at once, the musical, the literary, and the devotional. Many books have been written for the use of the lecturer on hymns. The latest is a complete history of the subject from the Song of Moses to 'The Rivulet' of Thomas Toke Lynch. It is, of course, a mere sketch, but the author, Mr. F. J. Gillman, is a master of the subject. And it is a finished sketch. The title is *The Songs and Singers of Christendom* (Headley Brothers; 2s. net).

Here is another book on *Spiritual Power*. Its author is Mr. C. Dudley Lampen (Headley Brothers; 2s. net). Mr. Lampen is a poet as well as a prose writer, and every other chapter ends with a poem of his own composing. Well, we are promised spiritual power. There are many writers to tell us how to obtain it. Yet how few of us possess it. Neither prose nor poetry seems to do us much good in the matter. Mr. Lampen will be read—he is worth reading—but he will not do more for us than the rest have done.

There is not much reading in M. C. Fenwick's book, *The Church of Christ in Corea* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). But it is all to be read. It is a racy narrative of Mr. Fenwick's own call to foreign work and the foreign work he has accomplished, but it is more than that. It is an appeal to the Church to use fewer foreign and more native missionaries. 'The difference,' says Mr. Fenwick in one place, 'the difference between the men Pastor Sen has trained and those I have taught is, that his students have all "done well," whereas mine have all done ill.'

What we usually call Faith Healing, Dr. G. B. Cutten calls Mental Healing. He has written its history, under the title of *Three Thousand Years of Mental Healing* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is a popular history, illustrated with photographs, the photographs including John Alexander Dowie and Mary Baker Eddy. But it is a faithful history, its facts well sifted, its conclusions without prejudice.

Who would have believed at the end of the nineteenth century that by the beginning of the

second decade of the twentieth, the subject of keenest discussion in popular books and periodicals would once again be

Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute?

Dr. Frank Ballard is our most insistent and most successful writer in defence of Christianity against the infidel. And he is nothing if not popular. That is to say, he knows 'the bottom dog' as well as Mr. Blatchford knows him, and we take leave to say that he has much more sympathy with him. He writes for the multitude, even for the lower and less educated half of the multitude. And yet, the central theme of all Dr. Ballard's recent writing has been man's destiny and the freedom of his will. His latest book is entitled *Determinism: False and True* (Kelly; 6s. net).

Now the man who undertakes the public defence of Christianity in these days has to know what he is about. The atheist is still abroad. But he is much better educated than before. The Christian apologist who makes a slip in fact, or ventures on a department of knowledge of which he has not made himself master, is pounced upon at once and dealt with mercilessly. It is a tribute to Dr. Ballard's learning that he covers the whole ground of Christian evidences and never once lets the enemy in.

More than that, the modern apologist must carry the campaign right through the enemy's country. For it cannot be denied that the materialists have conquered and are now in practical occupation of the minds of a vast number of men and women, especially of the working and lower classes. To carry the war successfully through such a country a man needs more than learning. He needs courage, and he needs the skill to read and write popularly. He needs clear thinking. He needs vigorous and caustic expression. Dr. Ballard has all these things. Take this footnote as a short example: 'If further proof be necessary, it may be found, *passim*, in the book *Not Guilty*, by Mr. Blatchford, which has undoubtedly put the "Deterministic" theory before the minds of more people in this country than any other volume has done. One more specimen will be conclusive—"All praise and all blame are undeserved. A tramp has murdered a child on the highway, has robbed her of a few coppers and thrown her body into a ditch. Do you mean to say that that tramp could

not help doing that? Do you mean to say he is not to blame? Do you mean to say he is not to be punished? Yes; I say all those things, and if all those things are not true, this book is not worth the paper it is printed on" (p. 203). Unless the tramp be insane, the book is rightly estimated.'

The Rev. F. Zorell, S.J., has got out the second and third parts of his *Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum* (Parisii: P. Lethielleux). They carry the Lexicon to near the end of the letter P. Will this Lexicon be translated? It would stand well between Hickey and Thayer.

Mr. H. Sutton Smith of the Baptist Missionary Society has written an account of the Protestant Mission at Stanley Falls, Upper Congo. He has given the book the title of *Yakusu, the very Heart of Africa* (Marshall Brothers; 6s. net). The people who are described in the book are the Lokele, and they are described in much detail. Now just as one savage looks like another to the newly arrived white man, so one tribe is very much like another tribe to those who are not thoroughly well acquainted with mission literature. But this tribe will live in the recollection of every reader of Mr. Smith's book, distinct and intimate, so close is the acquaintance that one makes with them. If Mr. Smith's purpose was to create an interest in his mission, he has certainly accomplished it.

Mr. L. S. A. Wells, M.A., who is working with Dr. Charles on the Oxford Apocrypha, has thrown off some by-product of his severe studies in five chapters intended to elucidate the thoughts of the Hebrews throughout the great silence from Malachi to Matthew. His chapters are: (1) The Peculiar People, 440-320 B.C.; (2) The Great Beast, 320-170 B.C.; (3) The Little Horn and the Kingdom of the Saints of the Most High, 168-63 B.C.; (4) The Day of the Lord, 63 B.C.-29 A.D.; and (5) The Great Refusal and the New Election, 29-132 A.D. The title of the book is *The Choice of the Jews: A Tragedy and a Lesson* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Andrew Murray has written a Commentary on the Reports of the Conference on Missions held in Edinburgh in 1910. His argument is that the Church is not responding to our Lord's demand for the conversion of the world.

And the reason of its failure he finds in the absence of persistent prayer. The title of his book is therefore *The State of the Church*; and its sub-title is 'A Plea for more Prayer' (Nisbet; 2s. 6d.). The book is printed after the style of Mr. Murray's Commentary on the Hebrews, the emphatic words being given in clarendon type throughout the page. This is useful to catch the eye of the busy reviewer, but it has a way of interrupting the steady reader. Nevertheless the book should be read right through. It gathers momentum as it goes.

Dr. Oesterley and Mr. Box must be congratulated on the call for a second edition of their great work on *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons). They themselves rejoice. But chiefly, like true scholars, because they are thus offered the chance of making the book better than before. They have made it better. They have read the reviews of it (and some very searching reviews there were, such as that which appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly*); they have read the new literature; and they have considered and consulted much on the subjects of most controversy. Accordingly the new edition is described as revised and corrected throughout. A certain amount of new matter has been added. The sections dealing with the Pharisees and Reform Judaism have been entirely rewritten, and a new section on Zionism has been inserted. Besides all this, the section on the Dispersion has been much enlarged, and additional notes have been written dealing with the works of Philo and the Rabbinical Seminaries. Last of all, and not least of the improvements, the price is reduced to 7s. 6d. net.

The Rev. W. B. Norris, M.A., Rector of Warblington, has discovered *A Key to Life's Mystery*, and has been bold enough to make it public in a volume of six hundred pages. The key is really quite simple. Man is a creature of two moods, a good mood and a bad. And the key is: Encourage the good mood that is in you and discourage the bad. And in order that you may encourage the good mood and discourage the bad, Mr. Norris quotes for your use passages of prose and of poetry from a vast number of writers beginning with Homer and ending with Henry Drummond. Sometimes he quotes single sentences, sometimes whole scenes. Here you snatch an apothegm from Epictetus, there you work your way through a long chapter of John Inglesant.

And it has all been very acceptable. For this is the third edition of the book, rewritten and greatly enlarged (Simpkin; 7s. 6d. net).

Dr. J. Sparhawk Jones is an original preacher. You will find his style occasionally in England, but this steady, quiet, argumentative discourse is most unusual in America. A sentence may fill from twelve to twenty lines, a paragraph may cover three pages. And the expression is so appropriate and the thought so rich that the reader (we say nothing of the hearer) passes from one sermon into another as if unable to find enough of it. There is a certain orthodoxy in the volume—not orthodoxy that is cramping, but that is steady—gives the reader a sense of permanent worth. The title of the book is *Saved by Hope* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press; \$1).

The Gift of Healing in the Church.

BY THE REV. W. F. COBB, D.D., RECTOR OF ST. ETHELBURGA'S, LONDON.

OUR earliest witness for the presence of the gift of healing in the Church is St. Paul. According to him, (1) the gift of healing was practised (1 Co 12); (2) it proceeded from the Spirit (v.^{9b}); (3) it was one of many extraordinary gifts (v.²); (4) it was not conferred on all (v.³⁰); (5) it was one of the greater gifts, and as such was to be sought for (v.³¹); (6) like the other gifts its primary object was the

common good (v.⁷); and (7) the high road to its attainment was the way of Love (v.³¹).

We are given also in the New Testament some typical stories of the exercise of this gift. Peter and John healed a lame man at the temple-door in the name of Jesus Christ (Ac 3⁶). Peter cured the paralyzed Æneas (Ac 9³⁴), and raised Tabitha from the dead (v.⁴⁰). Philip also healed many lamed

and paralyzed folk in Samaria, and exorcised many evil spirits (87). This was indeed a common occurrence in Jerusalem according to Ac 5¹⁸. Paul too healed a cripple at Lystra (14¹⁰), and healed and exorcised in Ephesus (19¹²).

These stories are related with an air of modesty and sense of proportion, and yet at the same time they seem almost inevitable in the circumstances. So wonderful was the new life that it was but natural it should have consequences out of the common even on the material plane. But there were limits to the gift. Raising from the dead was not impossible, but it was rare. Tabitha and Eutychus are the only cases, and the latter is probably not a case at all.

But though healing and exorcism were naturalized in the Apostolic Church, we feel that they are less at home than in the Gospel story. If the saying about doing greater works referred to so-called miracles, then the Apostles did not actualize it (Jn 14¹²), for the Lord's signs were greater than theirs. Yet the two groups have a family likeness. The most characteristic works of the Lord as of His disciples were prophecy, healing and exorcism, and in all three cases they were the final consequence of the spiritual life which was being opened up.

When we pass from the Apostolic to the Isapostolic Age the mist thickens. Those who speak have less to say, and they speak in a subdued tone. They speak sometimes from hearsay only, as, for example, do Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, ii. 32-34) and Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii. 39) of the power of raising from the dead. On the other hand, Irenæus in the same passage says that 'some do certainly and truly drive out devils, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently believe, and join themselves to the Church. Others have foreknowledge of things to come; they see visions and utter prophetic expressions. Others, again, heal the sick by laying their hands upon them, and they are made whole.' He adds that these gifts of exorcism, clairvoyance, and healing are given not through incantations, but through calling on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Justin Martyr tells the same tale in his second *Apology* addressed to the Roman Senate. 'Numberless demoniacs,' he says, 'throughout the whole world and in your city have many of our Christian men healed and are healing many, driving the devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, or by those who

use incantations and drugs' (§ 6; cf. also *Apol.*, § 30).

Again, arguing with Trypho, a Jew, he affirms that heathen when they became Christians received gifts, each as he was worthy. 'For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God,' where healing and teaching take the place in the sevenfold gifts of wisdom and godliness (§ 39; cf. § 76).

Tertullian, too, is express as to the existence in his days of one branch of healing, namely, the casting out of evil spirits, and speaks of it as a fact admitted by the heathen themselves (*Apol.*, § 23, 37, 43; *de Idol.*, 11). In his Montanist days, however, he demands from his Catholic opponent apostolic and prophetic evidence that he had the power of forgiving sin, that is, he bids him raise the dead, or cure the feeble, as the Apostles did. He adds that a *pneumatic* Church alone has the power of forgiving sin, and (by implication) of healing the sick (*De Pud.*, c. 21). He speaks, however, as if this power of healing was not practised within his personal observation.

By the beginning of the third century, the gifts of healing, exorcism, and prophecy have lost the lusty vigour of their youth. Origen can speak only of them as leaving their 'traces among those who regulated their lives by the precepts of the gospel' (*Contra Celsum*, i. 2). In another passage, however, he tells us that the followers of Æsculapius maintained that they frequently saw their god healing and doing good and foretelling the future, while they called those people 'silly' who acknowledged the existence of Jesus and testified that He had given them a marvellous power to cure by the invocation of His name. Origen adds that 'we too have seen many persons freed from grievous calamities and from "ecstasies," and madness and countless other ills which could be cured neither by men nor devils' (*ibid.*, iii. 24).

The results of this brief inquiry into the subject of healing in the primitive Church are definite as far as they go, and may be summed up thus:—

(1) The charismatic ministry of healing was most abundantly evinced in the Person of Jesus Christ, and was joined in Him with many other gifts not found in His disciples.

(2) The further we travel from His period on

earth, the less strong and less frequent do the gifts of the Spirit show themselves.

(3) The most persistent of them are the gifts of healing, exorcism, and prophecy.

(4) As they die away, the greater is the emphasis laid on the moral superiority of Christians over heathens.

(5) The decay of the gifts moves *pari passu* with the naturalizing (or secularizing) of the Church.

(6) The charismatic ministry of healing was bestowed on lines other than official. The priest did not possess the gift as a priest, nor was it withheld from the layman because he was a layman.

There is no need to discuss in detail the manifestations of the gift of healing in the later Church, nor would it be easy. For the difficulty of the discussion is like the difficulty attending an inquiry into modern spiritualism. It is not the want of material for a judgment which causes now our perplexity. It is its abundance, and its inequality. Ecclesiastical 'miracles' of healing are there by the thousand, but it is a minority of them alone which stand the test of cross-examination. But there is enough to warrant the statement that what had now come to be called 'miraculous' healings were of not infrequent occurrence. Every man or woman of saintly character was expected to work miracles, and, therefore, it was natural that he should. Some would call miracles endemic in the mediæval Church. Perhaps they were. Perhaps the universal belief in their possibility afforded the conditions necessary for their becoming actual.

Hence we shall not be quick to reject the story of St. Augustine of Canterbury healing at Eboracum a man who was at once blind and paralyzed (Newman, *Lives of the English Saints*, iii. p. 381). It will sound to us quite natural that St. Walburga should have been sent by an inner impulse to the death-bed of the daughter of a neighbouring baron, and by her prayers continued through the night at the bedside should have brought the maiden back to life (*ibid.*, ii. 105).

St. Germanus is another example of healing power attending on sanctity. The sick came to him at Ravenna from all sides, and were healed. He brought back from apparent death the son of a court official, and cast the devil from another young man afflicted with 'falling sickness' (*ibid.*, ii. 418).

Similar cases of healing are found throughout Church history. It would be the very height of

unreason to dismiss them all as due to fraud, or credulity, or party-spirit. Whatever the proportion of non-fact to fact among them may be, there is truth in Pascal's remark that 'the existence of the false necessarily points to the existence of the true as their antecedent cause' (*Pensées*, ii. 235), even as the similarity of the stories about ghosts witnesses to their having a true cause behind them.

We are justified, therefore, in concluding that the gift of healing, which flourished in the early Church and then decayed, reappeared in later times amid much that was false, and though now labelled as miraculous bore witness to the fact that the same Power which healed in earlier days had never ceased His healing activity, but manifested it wherever He found a person fitted to be His instrument.

Some light may be thrown, perhaps, on the nature of the power of healing by a consideration of the numerous cases in which this power has been exercised through relics or other sacred objects. The belief that cures have been worked by means of relics, or at the tombs or shrines of saints, or by the use of some object associated with a saint, is found in every age of the Church; indeed, the relics of the saints seem to have been more efficacious than their living bodies. Moreover, as sanctity is unprovable, except so far as it finds expression in supernormal effects, the demand of the Roman Church authorities that proof of 'miracles' shall precede canonization is entirely reasonable. It is true that grave warnings are given against building on visions, voices, powers, and supernormal happenings, but this is only because experience has shown how narrow is the boundary line between delusion and the transcendental order of being next above us. But this caution does not contradict, it rather implies, belief in the possibility of the supernormal. Indeed, the belief of the Church has always been that if 'miracles' did not happen, it would be a miracle that they did not.

Examples of the cures in question are numerous. There are, for example, the apparently unquestionable cures effected at the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury immediately after his death. Take the witness of John of Salisbury. 'There,' he says, speaking of the shrine, 'great miracles are wrought. . . . For in the place of his passion, and in the place where he lay before the great altar previous to burial, and in the place where he was at last

buried, paralytics are cured, the blind see, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the lame walk, lepers are cured . . . and (a thing unheard of from the days of our fathers) the dead are raised' (E. A. Abbott, *St. Thomas of Canterbury*, i. 227).

Benedict, a Canterbury monk and familiar with the archbishop, also tells us that on the third day after the martyrdom the news of it reached the wife of a Sussex knight, suffering from weakness and blindness. She then vowed herself to the saint, and immediately she began to recover, and on the sixth day she rose from her bed. The good monk winds up his account of this miracle with the pious remark: 'This beginning of signs did Jesus in Sussex of England, and manifested the glory of his martyr before the faces of his disciples who ate and drank with him before he was slain' (*Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*). If Benedict may transplant a second century remark for the benefit of the twelfth century, what is to hinder our doing the same for the twentieth?

We may take one other illustration of the use of material objects in the working of cures, in the famous case of Marguerite Périer, a boarder at Port Royal in 1656. She had been suffering there for eighteen months at the age of ten from a lachrymal fistula; the bone of the nose was diagnosed as carious, and purulent matter found its way thence into the throat. It happened, however, that an ecclesiastic who lived close by was in possession of an authentic spike from the Saviour's crown of thorns. He lent it to the nuns. They naturally paid due homage to the sacred relic, and an *exposition* took place in the Church. When Marguerite approached, one of the sisters, Sœur Flavie, noticing her swollen face, applied to it the holy thorn. That day the cure was complete. Three weeks afterwards, five physicians and two surgeons signed and published a certificate, stating their belief that such a cure 'was beyond the ordinary power of nature, and could not have taken place without a miracle.' 'Finally, in 1728, when Port Royal had been destroyed, and the very bones of its saints cast out of their graves, Pope Benedict XIII. quotes in his printed works, the case of Marguerite Périer as a proof that in the true Church the age of miracles had not gone by' (see R. H. Hutton, *Essays Theological and Literary*, 2nd ed. vol. i. pp. 33-35).

We have here, then, two cases out of thousands sufficiently convincing that inanimate objects so

called do actually assist in the curing of disease, whatever the explanation may be. Probably we shall find that it will help us materially to understand something of the true nature of the charismatic ministry of healing as exercised by persons in the flesh.

The fact being now beyond question that charismatic healing meets us in the lives of Christ and His Apostles, in the Early Church, and indeed in every age of the Christian Church, there now remains only to inquire into its nature and the method of its working.

In the first place, it seems to demand a certain receptiveness on the part of those who are its patients. In His own country Jesus could do no mighty work because of its unbelief (Mk 6^{5, 6}). On the other hand, He declared repeatedly that it was the faith of His patients which had made them whole. He insisted that all things are possible to him that has faith (Mk 9²³). He asks of the impotent man whether he had the will to become well (Jn 5⁶).

In accordance with these statements is the observation that an atmosphere of faith in a Church, people, or age is one in which the gift of healing is most likely to occur and to succeed.

A similar phenomenon is observable in other departments of life. A genius demands for his usefulness, and indeed for his appearance at all, a circle of appreciative friends who may at once stimulate, support, and concentrate his efforts. Witches flourished so long as witchcraft was believed in, and withered away in the chilling air of a rationalistic age. Great leaders of men rarely appear in democracies; they come to peoples who are willing to be led. They have no work to do where everybody is his own leader. Prophets rise when there is a hunger for the words of God, and poets are dumb when there is no ear that cares for their music.

So it is with the gift of healing. It can flourish only, like all living things, in a congenial soil. Why a rationalistic age is unable to supply that soil is not because it is pushing the claims of Reason, but because it is arrogant, that is, self-sufficient, that is, non-receptive. Before Faith can dwell in the soul, the soul must be emptied of its pride. For the faith through which cures are effected is more than assent to what is credible, more than belief, more than obedience to authority, more than passive receptiveness. It

is an active force. It is the life of God in the soul, and where that life is active there is purity, power, and health.

It should not, however, be hastily assumed that this indwelling faith can be called into activity only by affirmation of personal mind. To repeat continually: 'I am Love; I am Health; I am Righteousness; I am Abundance; I am Wisdom; I am Healing Power; I am Achievement because I am one with God,' is a form of auto-suggestion which does not necessarily do more than dispose the heart for the unspeakable gift of God. It may be true to say that 'disease, weakness, marks of old age, are only the resultant effects of thought'; that 'worry, folly, poverty, lust, decrepitude are simply the reflections of mind,' and yet that such an affirmation may be but a half-truth, for health, strength, peacefulness, wisdom, wealth, purity and vitality are the results of something besides thinking. They are such results, and they are not. They are, so far as right thinking has provided, the conditions under which such blessings as health and strength have been made possible. They are not, so far as it is a power not ourselves which performs the good work in us.

It seems necessary just now to insist on the importance of this distinction in view of the chronic inability of the average man to maintain the law of balance of allied opposites. He is apt to forget either the Transcendence of God or His Immanence. For some centuries he has neglected the latter. He is tempted to-day to ignore the former. Yet both truths are necessary both to sane thinking and to healthy living. That living thing we call Faith is the God indwelling in us. But the experience of ages is express. It says plainly that the indwelling power calls for the transcendent power to awake it, and that that transcendent power is something greater and deeper than any affirmation made by the personal self. God works not only *within* us, but also *upon* us. The Divine more often slumbers within, waiting quietly for the hour when the lower self shall have been sufficiently purified and braced as to be able to respond to the impulse directed upon it from without. It may be the shock of a great joy or a great sorrow, a great loss or a great gain, but it is not the shock itself which arouses the sleeping Deity within. It is the Transcendent God using the shock for the purpose of piercing

through the veil of habit, sloth, and ignorance which shut off all approach to the Holy of Holies within.

THE PLACE OF THE HEALER.

It is here that the Spiritual Healer has his place. He is not himself the Healer, but only the organ, or the agent, of the Great Healer. He is the channel through which the power of God flows to the person who needs it. What is more, his agency is a necessary factor in the work of healing, in virtue of what appears to be a cosmic law. For the Divine force in the universe remains latent until such time as it is focussed in some form through which it may work. This law holds good of God's healing power as of all His powers. Hence, though He is always ready and waiting to heal, He does not actually heal until an entrance is found for Him into the world of suffering through some finite agency. The province of the Spiritual Healer is to provide such an agency.

Thus in the act of healing two things are required. It has its active and its passive side, as all things have. The passive side is supplied by the faith of the sick person, which in its turn is closely bound up with the general faith of the community. When healing is in the air, more people are prepared and are fit to be healed.

The active side is supplied by the Divine life focussed in an individual who somehow is fitted to be its channel.

There is no *a priori* ground for limiting the channel of healing to an individual spirit still in the flesh. We have seen that all ages of the Church witness to the healing work of Christ in His Church militant. But they witness no less clearly to the fact that excarnate spirits take their part also. This seems to be the truth underlying all genuine instances of healing by means of relics. For neither of the two other explanations given seem to be adequate. One of these ascribes the cure to 'faith-healing.' But, as we have seen above, the faith of the sick man is but one of the two co-operant factors concerned. The second explanation refers, with Dr. Newman, to the power conferred on those material atoms which have formed part of the body of a saint. They have acquired something of the nature of Spirit itself. In this case, however, it is not the bone which works the cure, but the higher potency which has attached itself to the bone. But if

this be so, it is far simpler to say that the healing efficacy of the saint's spirit resides not so much in his discarded physical skeleton, as in his present higher body. In other words, where cures are effected by means of relics, or at such centres as Lourdes, or at one of the many holy wells, the most natural explanation is that which sees there the working of some excarnate spirit, angel, or other being who finds in the faith of the sufferer a suitable response.

It should be added that there seems no necessity for assuming that in all cases the name of the active healing spirit is that which we on this side give it. Whether the voices of Jeanne D'Arc's guides came from those known on earth by the names of Margaret and Catherine, or from some other beings, makes little difference. They were, anyhow, genuine spirit-voices, and they enabled Jeanne to do what they sent her to do. Similarly, we may assign cures to our Lady of Walsingham, or of Lourdes, or to St. Patrick, or St. James of Compostella, or to the Holy Coat, or a piece of the Cross, or to some relic, but all that we can be sure of is that *some* agent of the Christ is at work, and we shall give the glory to God, acknowledging that His power is not estopped by our mistake, if mistake there be.

CHARISMATIC HEALING AND SANCTITY.

We may ask next how far the power of charismatic healing depends on the sanctity of the healer. The question is somehow confused by the fact that sanctity is not of a uniform type. In the case of the Christ, as in that of the Buddha, the history says clearly that He was not an ascetic. Nor were His immediate disciples. On the other hand, mediæval sanctity was inseparable from asceticism. Yet in all three cases cures were performed. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that what is essential to sanctity is not so much asceticism as self-surrender to God, and that this very self-surrender is the necessary pre-condition of all the work of a spiritual healer. For it is God which worketh in him both to will and to do. He is always the Healer, and is always ready to heal. But where the will is set towards the separated self, His power cannot get through. Where, on the contrary, the will is set on Him as the Universal Self,—where, in other words, sanctity is,—there He can and does heal through His saint.

Closely allied with the truth that sanctity, as

above defined, is a condition to be fulfilled on the part of the healer, is the further truth that in some degree it is also required of the patient. We say 'in some degree,' because God blesses from the beginning, and does not wait for the end. Yet we ought to be on our guard against the temptation to divorce sickness from its cause. Its cause is in every case to be found in a wrong state of the will somewhere—if not in the sufferer, then in his ancestors, or relations, or friends, or others. He may be suffering from his own misdeeds, and while he clings to them he cannot be healed, nor should we expect or wish him to be healed. He may have begun to see the truth through his sufferings, and in that case he has begun to be ready for healing. He may have come to love the truth now made clear by suffering, and if so, he is now ripe for healing. He may, again, be suffering vicariously as a redeemer, and in that case there is no healing to be done, for release will come only when redemption is complete.

THE CHARISMA GENERAL OR PARTICULAR?

One final question remains, and that is, whether the gift of healing is to be regarded as the prerogative of a few, or whether it is to be looked for generally in the Church. St. Paul certainly implies that it was given to some only, when he asks: 'Have all gifts of healings?' We should, however, bear in mind that he has in view open and unmistakable manifestations of the working of the Spirit, that is, such workings as were so intense as to stand out as exceptional. He does not consider the case where all have some healing power, though the degree of it may be low, or where it is overshadowed by more striking gifts, as, *e.g.*, where a low degree of healing power is united with the gift of tongues to an eminent and remarkable extent.

The true answer to our question would seem to be that wherever there is Faith at all there is proportionate healing power, even though its possessor is unaware of its existence. For where faith is, God is; and where God is, there is healing power. But the possession of faith, in its more elementary stages, does not entitle a man to the special charisma of healing. This is a gift, and like all God's gifts is not given according to rule, or rather man's rule, for God follows the rule of the counsel of His own will. If we were to adopt a familiar phraseology and say that the gifts of

God descend in a sevenfold stream of light, and that the ruler, the healer, the man of action, the priest, the philosopher, the poet, and the initiate represent the several rays, then, varying St. Paul, we might say that to one it is given to be a healer, another a priest, another a poet, and so on. So that the gift of healing bears an exceptional character.

Yet, exceptional as it may seem to be, it is not to be regarded as lawless. Law, that is, Wisdom and Justice, runs through all things. We may be sure, therefore, that Wisdom and Justice lie behind the gift of healing, if only we had eyes to track them. There must be some answer somewhere to the question: 'Why has one man received the gift of healing, and not another?' Or, as the question should be put: 'Why has this particular man this particular gift? Has he done anything that I have not done, to win it or earn it?' Here we may guess, but we cannot know. Yet a guess may do good.

If for convenience we accept the sevenfold division of gifts just referred to, we may say that all the seven modes of activity are alike necessary

and valuable, but that the individual's own choice determines which shall be allotted to him. It may be that in the earlier stages of his eternal career some seemingly small exercises of his own free-will sent him off to this or that path of development; and that then he took his place for the æon on the path corresponding to his choice. We who see what comes out only say that he has the gift of healing, or of thinking, or of inspiring, or ruling, or acting, or what not. But He who sees the whole inner history of the man knows that he is where he is, and is gifted as he is, in obedience to a law, which is but Wisdom and Justice at work.

To conclude: Healing is a gift; it is given according to Law; it is to be exercised under Law; it may show itself as vital, magnetic, mental, or spiritual, but it is God's very power working in these different forms which is that which heals. He Himself makes the agent; it is He who supplies him with power. It is He too who brings together healer and patient, and creates the spark of health from their contact. To Him, therefore, be all the glory.

Contributions and Comments.

A Protest against that Chaotic Monstrosity 'Comparative Religion.'

TEN years ago I was a member of the Theological Board of Studies of the newly constituted teaching University of London. We were engaged in the delicate task of framing the course of theological discipline for the degrees in Divinity, and in that work we attained satisfactory results. We were about twenty in number, and included representatives of the Anglican Church, Wesleyan Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists. While the atmosphere without was rent with storms over the elementary education in religious knowledge of children under fourteen, we calmly deliberated without the slightest suspicion or mistrust, and solved all our problems respecting the theological instruction of our respective students for the Christian ministry.

We fortunately had a very able chairman, Principal Robertson of King's College, now Bishop

of Exeter. Among the subjects for the final B.D. examination it was agreed that an optional department should be admitted, mainly for the benefit of our missionary students, namely, that which is endowed with the evil name 'Comparative Religion.' The absurdity of the title was duly pointed out. Religion, it was argued, is not a science, but a concrete living reality. We can speak of a comparative science because a science is founded on observation and comparison and the resulting classification of phenomena and the determination of their relations. We can therefore talk of comparative grammar or comparative physiology, anatomy, or morphology, because in each case we are dealing with the collection and grouping of observed facts and the determination of their inter-relations. Comparative grammar of the Semitic languages involves merely an extension of the same processes that are applied to a single language such as Aramaic or Arabic. But one need not be a follower of Ritschl, who exposed

the vice of confusing knowledge with religion, to see in a moment the absurdity of such an expression as 'Comparative Religion.' As well talk of comparative tree, comparative dog, or comparative language. Under the wise guidance of the Bishop of Exeter, we ultimately landed in the safe designation: *Comparative Study of Religion*.

But old abuses die hard, and the old unintelligible term still passes current. The mischief extends further than is usually supposed. There are some well-meaning people who imagine that some kind of universal jumble of religion—Mohammedan, Christian, Buddhistic—may furnish a quasi world-religious Esperanto which is to take the place of the old historic religions. We are to be satisfied with a compound photograph. Putting these idle fancies aside, I would suggest that readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES should ask themselves whether this monstrosity 'Comparative Religion' should not be finally extinguished. Unfortunately we are hardly accustomed to use 'science' as the Germans employ 'Wissenschaft.' Our physicists have almost monopolized it. I much wish that our British and American theologians would more resolutely claim their rights. *Vergleichende Religionswissenschaft* is perhaps less strange to German ears than 'Comparative Science of Religion' is to our own. 'Comparative Theology' would be misleading, because hardly adequate. We have no recognized Greek word for 'religion' on which to attach our *-logy*. This would dispel our difficulties. Meanwhile I would propound the modest yet adequate formula suggested by the Bishop of Exeter. And if henceforth any one is tempted to lapse into 'Comparative Religion,' may the Socratic *daimōn* visit him with remorseful twinge and whisper ὦ γαθέ, ἀποπὸν τι λέγεις εὐφήμει.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

Cambridge.

The Belief in the Miraculous in New Testament Times.

PRINCIPAL GARVIE, in his excellent paper entitled 'The Living Christ and the Historical Jesus' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June, criticises Harnack's view of miracles (p. 404). We miss in the article any reference to the book of Harnack's quoted, but the argument and the language sug-

gest *Das Wesen des Christentums*. The German professor is held to assert that miracles were in our Lord's day 'almost something commonplace' ('fast etwas Alltägliches' in *Das Wesen*, 1906, p. 16). To this apparently Professor Garvie objects. 'In ascribing miracles to Jesus, the evangelists knew that they were affirming something exceptional of Him.' With this statement of the article we are not in the least disposed to quarrel. Were there any doubt of its truth after a reading of the Synoptics, all such doubt would disappear after a study of the earliest speeches of the apostles as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, where the apologetic is on the basis of the works of Jesus. But that the statements of the two professors are contradictory or at variance we are not prepared to admit. The question at issue is one which has scarcely received the attention it deserves. It is that of the place of the miraculous in the popular thought of our Lord's day. Harnack really maintains that the popular mind was accustomed to and expectant of miracles when Jesus came. A predisposition to believe in them was in the mental make-up of the time. Professor Garvie's position, on the other hand, seems to imply that anything of a miraculous nature was to the people an entirely new and unexpected phenomenon introduced by our Lord.

Now it cannot be denied that there is evidence in the New Testament to support the German savant's view. 'The Jews require a sign.' They were a people expecting in any religious teacher signs confirming His claims. What was a sign to them? Any one reading the account of the incident where Pharisees came to Jesus demanding a sign, will come to the conclusion that they required something exceptional, something extraordinary. But were there not signs enough? Were there not all the miracles of healing that Jesus had already performed? Obviously the Pharisees demanded something more than these. These were not convincing enough. The incident clearly suggests that some at least of our Lord's miracles were not then regarded as so extraordinary, as they have been held by later Christians. Can it be that these were not 'exceptional of Him'? Can it be that He was only one miracle-worker among others? One word of Christ has been preserved which casts a flood of light on a page that would otherwise be very dark. After the healing of the man blind and dumb, the Pharisees accused Jesus

of casting out devils by the aid of Beelzebub. Our Lord's reply was a counter-charge. 'And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore shall they be your judges' (Mt 12²⁷ = Lk 11¹⁹). Obviously our Lord was not alone in working miracles. Some miracles at least—on the admission of Jesus Himself—were performed by the adherents of the various religious schools. If Harnack somewhat exaggerates when he declares that miracles were 'fast etwas alltäglichen,' clearly we cannot go so far on the other side and regard all miracles as exceptional of Jesus. The account of the same incident, however, lets it be clearly seen that the work was regarded by the people as something extraordinary. 'And all the multitudes were amazed,' and it was the amazement apparently that gave rise to the whole conversation. However, it is not impossible psychologically to harmonize this with the fact that many in that day claimed and exhibited this power of healing. Such an instantaneous cure would naturally be regarded as miraculous and call forth expressions of astonishment. Men would marvel at the cure, then as now, even if it occurred six times every day. The miraculous would still appear miraculous, no matter how many people performed it. And it would still go by the name of 'sign,' 'wonder,' 'power,' even though our Lord was one amongst many.

The evidence, we conclude, justifies us in the view that a belief in the miraculous was not a new element arising from the work of Jesus, but was part of the outlook of the day. Our Lord's miracles were rather an accommodation to prevalent opinion.

Such a view brings not a little help to the understanding of some of the incidents recorded in the New Testament. It has always been a difficulty to account for the faith—at times, stupendous, of those who came to Jesus and sought His wonderful power. Various suggestions have at different times been made, the commonest being that the fame of Jesus being noised abroad gave the sick encouragement to look for a cure. But that by itself scarcely seems enough. How, for instance, shall we account for the confidence of a woman, who, after suffering twelve years with an incurable disease, and having spent all on physicians, believes that by merely touching the hem of Christ's garment she will be made whole? To have heard of Christ's cures was something, but

more is required to explain such an astounding confidence. However, if we can assume that in her mental attitude there was grounded a firm belief in such miraculous cures, if there was in her mind a predisposition to believe in such, that, added to what she had heard of Christ, seems sufficient to explain her attitude. The very fact that physicians had failed, would make her more disposed to rely on the miraculous. It would be her last hope—and such a hope dies hard. If there were other miracle-workers in Palestine, had she tried them? It is not unlikely. But even then the reports of Christ would revive all the old hope of such a healing, and make her feel that at last the man had come who could do this thing. In her case and in that of many another, the fact of the astonishing faith is simplified by the assumption of a widespread popular belief in miraculous cures. Such a belief there would be if, as we have seen, others besides our Lord and before Him had claimed the power of healing the sick. It would seem that Harnack is correct when he asserts that in our Lord's day 'man fühlte und sah sich von Wundern umgeben' (p. 16).

However, if this is correct, how are we to explain the undoubted fact that 'in ascribing miracles to Jesus the evangelists knew that they were affirming something exceptional of Him,' and that the first appeal by the disciples to the Jews to believe on Him was on the basis of these very works? This would seem to be accounted for by the fact that, although there were other miracle-workers, our Lord was without compeer in this as in other realms. So far as the evidence goes, others wrought only miracles of healing. Our Lord wrought others besides. There were the nature miracles, and the raising of the dead. These, so far as we can judge, were characteristic of the Lord alone. Whether it was miracles of this class, which exhibited supremely His control of the laws of nature, or whether it was the *nature* of His miracles of healing which raised Him in the eyes of the people head and shoulders above all other workers in the same field, it is impossible to determine. Certain it is, that while miracles were not 'exceptional of Him,' *His* miracles were. That the people recognized, as is made clear in all the narratives, and that, too, the disciples saw, as is obvious from the opening chapters of the Acts. In conclusion, it may be noticed that in Acts the miracles are only used to show 'that God was

with him' (2^{22, 23} 10³⁸). The fact that His miracles were remarkable *among miracles* shows that God was with Him in a remarkable degree. And further, *the* great miracle in the early apologetic was His own Resurrection (Ac 2^{24, 31, 36} 3¹⁵ 5³⁰ 10⁴⁰). That is for the apostles the great proof of His divinity. And in that the Lord stood alone. No wonder-worker, not even the 'sons of the Pharisees,' had equalled Him there.

ARTHUR DAKIN.

Manchester.

2 Cor. xii. 9 in the Revised Version.

THE answer to Professor Nestle's inquiry is rather an old story. In 1899 the late Bishop Westcott 'called the attention of the Syndics of the Press to this reading ("strength"), and pointed out that he believed it would be a mistake. The original notes made during the revision were referred to, and from these it clearly appeared that the revisers intended the word "power" to be substituted for the word "strength," but that this change had not been carried out; it was therefore agreed by the two Presses that the correction should be made, so as to give effect to what was shown from the documents to be the intention of the revisers.' This quotation is from a communication from the Cambridge University Press printed in *The Guardian* in December 1907. C. S. WARD.

Walsham Priory, Suffolk.

A Note on 'Power on the Head.'

AN old interpretation of the obscure phrase *ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς* (1 Co 11¹⁰), which has gained some favour in modern times, is that *ἐξουσία* means a talisman or phylactery to ward off the intrusion of spirits, who were supposed to have intercourse with women through their mouths or ears. This idea maintained itself very late: in a mediæval hymn to the Virgin (Lincoln MSS. Ff. i. 6. 42), I find:

Gaude virgo mater Christi,
Quae per aurem concepisti.

But the objection to this interpretation is twofold: *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους* must mean *on account of* (not *against*) the *angels* (not evil spirits): for there can

have been no danger to women from good angels during a sacred service. Is not the following a more likely view? Women were under the guardianship of angels, who were their spiritual lovers, and were jealous of their human attachments. (Compare the story of Cecilia, well known from Chaucer's version in the 'Second Nun's Tale.') During a service these angels would be specially jealous of their protégées' human husbands, towards whom the women might be inclined to cast glances. To prevent such danger, the women were to wear talismans over the head. Yet, Paul adds, this does not involve a complete severance between men and women *ἐν κυρίῳ*, in the Christian life: at proper times intercourse is allowable. Such an interpretation gives a natural meaning to *ἐξουσία* (cp. *ἐξουσιάζει*, 1 Co 7⁴), to *διά*, and to *ἀγγελοι*: it maintains the parallelism with *διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα* (11.⁹), and suits the context.

E. E. KELLETT.

Cambridge.

What kind of Food was it that Tamar made for Amnon? (2 Sam. xiii. 5-8).

THE Hebrew words used in the narrative appear to give definite answers to the following questions:—

- (1) WHAT SHAPE? ANSWER, *heart-shaped*, לִבְבוֹת.
- (2) OF WHAT SUBSTANCE? ANSWER, made of dough, דָּגָן, i.e. that which swells.
- (3) HOW MADE? ANSWER, kneaded, מְעֻשָּׂה.
- (4) HOW COOKED? ANSWER, boiled, מְבֻשָּׁל.

These Hebrews words, taken in their ordinary senses, dispose effectually of any such interpretations as *pancakes*, which are neither made of dough, nor kneaded, nor boiled; indeed, they dispose of any kind of *cakes*. But with equal clearness they point to what are called *hasty puddings* or *dough dumplings*, made of the dough of which bread is baked. The maker takes a small lump, twists or pats it into a globular shape and drops it into a pan of boiling water. It swells in cooking, and is very soon ready for eating. Its shape and size might very easily give it the name, *heart*.

We might improve our translation by substituting *dumplings* for 'cakes' and *boiled* for 'baked.'

H. HIGHFIELD.

Wesley College, Colombo.

The Interpretation of 2 Sam. viii. 2.

'HE measured two lines to put to death, and one full line to keep alive.'

As ordinarily understood, that is, that David slew, roughly speaking, two-thirds of his Moabite captives, one may remark on the considerable length of line, that is to say, *cord*, required, and the awkwardness as well as barbarity of the proceeding.

Another interpretation long ago suggested itself to me. Can this not be a kind of parallel to the story in Roman history of Tarquin and the chiefs of Gabii? David made his Moabite captives lie down one by one and measured them; those for whom one line was enough he allowed to escape death, but the taller ones, those who exceeded the one line's *full* length, and so who required two lines, he slew.

H. HIGHFIELD.

Wesley College, Colombo.

James iii. 5. . . . A Personal Reminiscence?

'BEHOLD, how much wood is kindled by how small a fire!'

The writer, whom many good scholars will regard as James and a brother of Jesus, like Jesus, was fond of teaching by pictures which develop rather into similes than parables. We are inclined to press his relationship to Jesus, but apt to forget that this entails a relationship to Joseph the Carpenter. May not this picturesque exclamation remind us a little of the latter? Behind or beside the carpenter's home was the woodyard with its logs and planks and shavings. There may even be in these 'graphic words the remembrance of some special incident of danger. Suppose, for example, that one of the sons had gone in search of a forgotten tool after dark with a light, but was called back by the father's voice uttering a warning almost in the words now commented on.

H. HIGHFIELD.

Wesley College, Colombo.

ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται (2 Thess. ii. 7).

I do not propose to say anything about the interpretation of the difficult 'eschatological' passage

2 Th 2³⁻¹², but merely to call attention to one phrase in it, which seems to have been somewhat misunderstood. St. Paul is telling his Thessalonian readers that 'the man of lawlessness' will for a time be restrained in regard to his evil activities, and that his power for mischief will not be fully manifested ἕως [ὁ κατέχων] ἐκ μέσου γένηται. It is generally held that this expression implies destruction or overthrow. H. St. J. Thackeray (*The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 140), adapting the usual view that the restraining force is the Roman Empire, points out that Jewish Apocalyptic writers constantly anticipate the destruction and fall of that Empire before the coming of Messiah. Among early commentators on the passage, Jerome and Chrysostom¹ agree that the words refer to the destruction of the Roman Empire. Bishop Ellicott regards the phrase as equivalent to ἕως ἐκ μέσου ἀρθῇ (1 Co 5², Is 57² [LXX]; Col 2¹⁴, where Lightfoot quotes the passage from 2 Thessalonians as a parallel). But are the two expressions equivalent? The one, ἐκ μέσου αἰρεσθαι, is, as Lightfoot says, a strong one. It implies an outside force, and, very often, destruction. The other, ἐκ μέσου γίνεσθαι, like the corresponding phrase in Herodotus, iii. 83, ἐκ μέσου καθέζεσθαι, denotes voluntary action. A like distinction between somewhat similar phrases is found in Latin. When, for instance, Cicero wishes to express the idea that his client's enemies were hoping to find his murder easy, he uses the words 'perfacile hunc incautum et rusticum . . . de medio tolli (= ἐκ μέσου αἰρεσθαι) posse' (Cic., *pro Sex. Roscio*, vii. 20). A little later on in the same speech (xxviii. 112), where he is rhetorically requesting some one to get out of his way, he says, 'recede de medio' (= ἐκ μέσου γενεῖν).

But we are not left to analogy. The writings of St. Paul's younger contemporary Plutarch, show clearly what is the real meaning of the rare phrase ἐκ μέσου γίνεσθαι, which occurs in the New Testament only in the passage before us. In the *Timoleon* (v. 3), Plutarch relates how his hero, after killing his brother for political reasons, found public opinion so strong against him that he resolved to retire (for a time as it turned out) from public life, ἔγνω ζῆν καθ' ἑαυτόν, ἐκ μέσου γινόμενος. The phrase is found in the same sense in *Nic. c. Crass.*, ii. 4, ἐκ μέσου γινόμενον καθῆσθαι. From

¹ His words are ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ Ῥωμαϊκὴ δταν ἀρθῇ ἐκ μέσου, κ.τ.λ.

these passages it seems clear that St. Paul contemplates the Restrainer rather as retiring voluntarily from the scene of action than as forcibly removed or overthrown. And this may have some bearing on the question of the interpretation of the passage as a whole, which, however, I promised at the outset not to discuss.

H. W. FULFORD.

Datchworth Rectory, Herts.

The Lake of Tiberius.

BOTH the *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* have an article on the 'Sea of Galilee'; the one under the letter G, in vol. ii. 102-104, by S. Merrill, the other under S, vol. ii. 587-594, by W. M. Christie. Both articles are worthy of the place where they stand, and of the subject with which they deal. But both need supplementing in one particular point, namely, on the name of the lake.

Merrill writes: 'Twice John employs "Sea of Tiberias" (*θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος*).'

Christie writes: 'The form "Sea of Tiberias" (*θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος*) occurs in Jn 6¹ 21¹. The modern designation "*Lake of Tiberias*" does not occur in the N.T. It is found for the first time as *λίμνη Τιβερίας* in Pausanias (v. 7).'

This looks all right, and similar statements are to be found everywhere; but there seems to be one letter wrong: was not the name 'Sea or Lake of Tiberius'? In both passages from John we do not read *θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος* as quoted above, but *τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος*. In other words, *τῆς Τιβεριάδος* may be adjective and attribute joined to, not noun depending on, *τῆς θαλάσσης*. This possibility becomes probability, when we consider parallel passages. Origen (in *John*, 6. 41), *περὶ τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Τιβεριάδα λίμνην*; Eusebius (*Onomastica*, 162. 4) *ἐπὶ τὴν Τιβεριάδα λίμνην*; though 74. 14, *παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος* (but note: *without* article!). The most interesting passage is in Josephus (*Bell. Jud.*, iii. 3, 5). Here the printed text has *μέχρι τῆς πρὸς Τιβεριάδα λίμνης*; Niese conjectured *τῆς πρὸς Τιβεριάδι λίμνης*, but the MSS. VRS, and Hegesippus read *τῆς Τιβεριάδος λίμνης*, and in his Index Niese gives '*Τιβερίων λίμνη*, B.J. iv. 456; *Τιβερίας λίμνη*, B. iii. 57.' In the passage of Pausanias quoted

by Christie, the Teubner edition of Schubert reads, *λίμνην Τιβεριάδα καλουμένην* (neither *Τιβερίδα* as quoted by Christie, nor *Τιβεριάδος*, as quoted by Furrer (*Znt W.*, 1902, 262). But whether *Τιβερίδα* or *Τιβεριάδα* be correct, this does not mean 'Lake of Tiberias,' as Christie translated; but 'Lake of Tiberius.'

Burkitt in the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* renders Jn 6¹ 'Lake of Tiberius,' giving 'Tiberias' as probable variant of the Sinai-Codex; Pusey-Guilliam has in both places '*mare Tiberii*'; though I confess that the spelling of the Syriac MSS. does not entitle us to be so positive on this point. Compare the spelling of the name 'Andreas' on the same page of the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*. The question would be settled if the statement had any foundation, which I find in Zeller's *Bibellektion* (Calw, 1892, p. 339), in the article 'Herodes Antipas.' It reads:

'In honour of the Emperor Tiberius he built a new capital for Galilee, "Tiberias," and, to retain for himself the favour of the emperor, he *changed* the name of the lake into Tiberias.'

There, the capital and the lake have both the same name, and the naming is in both cases ascribed to Antipas. But I can find no source for the statement that Antipas gave this name to the lake. However, from a linguistic point of view it seems probable that 'Tiberias' means 'the town and the lake of Tiberius,' and not 'the town of Tiberius' and 'the lake of Tiberias.' Note that John writes the town (6²³) without article; and thus Eusebius in the second passage. Josephus uses the name of the town in most cases without article, and several times with article, in some places the MSS. vary. Luther translated in Jn 21¹ at first 'meer Tiberias,' afterwards 'meer bei Tiberias.' In German we are accustomed to say 'der See Tiberias' (not 'of'). The parallel name *Τρωάς* stands nine times without article, only 2 Co 2¹² with article. The probability is therefore that the name of the lake means the lake of (the emperor) Tiberius, not of (the town) Tiberias. It would be interesting to learn what other objects besides towns and months (Cæsarea, Tiberias; July, August) were named after emperors; whether this was the case with lakes or mountains.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Unbiblical Views about Biblical Matters.

It would form an interesting publication if any one were to collect such common views about Biblical matters as are not warranted by the Bible itself. For instance, how old and how general is the view that the forbidden fruit of Paradise was an apple, though the Bible itself does not specify the tree? A mediæval verse runs: 'Māla māli mālō peperit māla maxima mundo.' That the Wise Men from the East were *three* in number is a general belief, though their number is not given in Matthew.

I hit recently at one time on two examples of such unwarranted views.

Both Justin Martyr and Tertullian find the number Twelve of the Apostles prototyped in the O.T.; Justin the Martyr by the number of the bells on the hem of the coat of the High Priest (*Dial.* 42): but nowhere in the Bible is it stated that these bells were *twelve* in number; Tertullian by the twelve springs of Elim, the twelve gems on the breastplate, the twelve stones which Joshua chose

from the Jordan and deposited in the ark of Covenant, 'duodecim lapides ab Jesu de Jordane electos et in arcam testamenti conditos' (*adv. Marc.* iv. 13). Nowhere do we read that these stones found a place there.

Quite different from the belief of Justin Martyr is that of Clement of Alexandria, who knows that the said bells were 360 in number, in agreement with the days of the Egyptian year. The Talmud states them to have been 72.

Even in Josephus we find such unbiblical views about Biblical matters, or in the N.T. statements which cannot be verified from the Old, that Salmon married Rahab (Mt 1), that Abraham was called *before* he came to Haran (Ac 7), that Saul reigned forty years (Ac 13), and so on.

In the Fathers of the Church occur many statements of a similar kind. That Simon was the companion of Cleophas on the way to Emmaus was the firm belief of Origen, etc. etc.

A collection and, if possible, an explanation of such unbiblical views would be welcome.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Religion at the Universal Races Congress.

BY THE REV. W. MARWICK, JAMAICA.

(A Member of the Congress.)

RELIGION generally, and the Christian religion in particular, fills a larger place in the volume of *Papers on Inter-Racial Problems*, prepared for, but held as read and only discussed at, the First Universal Races Congress, than an inspection of the table of contents seems to indicate. Professor Caldecott's paper was not the only one that set forth the Christian standpoint. But it is to be regretted that, though there were a good many Christians present and several took part in the discussions, the 'weight of evangelical Christianity' was not thrown on the side of this Congress as it ought to have been. It was left to the Ethica Societies, in the person of Professor Felix Adler of New York to initiate, and to Mr. Gustave Spiller to organize this Congress, so profoundly religious and ethical in idea and purpose. The volume of Papers, and the Record of the Proceedings when published, ought to be carefully studied, especially by all who profess to believe that 'there is neither barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus,' for this Congress illustrates the saying, 'He that is not against us is for us,' nay more, is likely to prove a powerful friend to the spiritual rebirth and religious advance of mankind.

Before the Congress met, an appeal 'To the Preachers of All Religions' was issued in these terms: 'To emphasise the world-embracing aims underlying the Congress, we humbly and yet most urgently request that a sermon or discourse in favour of inter-racial friendliness be delivered on Sunday, July 23rd, or on a day in the week preceding.' A similar appeal was addressed to 'Ministers and Directors of Public Instruction.'

It has to be premised that 'the particular opinions expressed by the writers [in the volume of Papers] are personal, and do not in any way commit the members of the Congress. Dr. Caldecott therefore wrote, not as the official representative of 'evangelical Christianity,' but in his individual capacity, and his paper was one of several dealing with 'The Modern Conscience in relation to Racial Questions (General).' A considerable variety of opinion is therefore to be found as well as plain statement of historic facts about religions, as, e.g., in Professor von Luschan's paper on 'The Anthropological View of Race,' in which he simply says: 'The religions of Buddha and of Christ have each conquered more than 500 millions of men, and Islam spreads from

Arabia as far as the West Coast of Africa, and eastward all through Asia, as far as the Indonesian Archipelago' (p. 21).

Language and Religion as Consolidating and Separating Influences were discussed in two papers, one on 'Language' by Professor D. S. Margoliouth, who also took an active part in the discussions of the Congress, and one on 'Religion' by Professor T. W. and Mrs. Rhys Davids. Religion as a Separating Influence was referred to in one of the papers on 'Fundamental Considerations,' namely, that on 'Race from the Sociological Standpoint,' by Professor Alfred Fouillée, who, in writing of 'ethnic consciousness' 'culminating nearly always in an assumption of *superiority*, and, for that very reason, in a feeling of natural *hostility*, says: 'Differences of language and of custom—and, above all, of religion—serve to intensify the hostility. All religion is sociological in character, and expresses symbolically the conditions native to the life or progress of a given society. The religion of a race converts it into a huge society animated by the same beliefs and the same aspirations. Moreover, all religion is intolerant and hostile to other religions. It believes itself to be the truth, and thus seeks to universalise that which is only the particular spirit of one race or one nation—e.g. the Jewish spirit, the Christian spirit, the Mahomedan spirit. When, then, the ethnic consciousness becomes at the same time a religious consciousness, the assertion of the individuality of a race implies a counter assertion to the individuality of other races. It is hidden warfare, passing over at the very first opportunity into open warfare (p. 25). He does not believe in 'religious propaganda.' The different religious beliefs of each race must be respected. 'Religions, through the whole course of history, have too often set nations at variance. If they have produced friendship and union, they have likewise produced discord, hate, and war. There is not a religion which has not, like Lady Macbeth, stains on the hand that all the vast oceans could never wash away' (p. 28). Religion, he holds, is not an 'article of export.' 'The only universal, the only really "catholic" things, in the Greek sense of the word, are science, philosophy, and morals. It is these things which we must peaceably introduce among races the most distant from our own. It is not the Christian religion which has transformed and will continue to transform Japan. It is science and industry.

Men of science are to-day the true and only missionaries. The inventors of railroads and telegraphs have done more to link different races together than all the Francis Xaviers and Ignatius Loyolas.' This French scientist is apparently acquainted only with Roman Catholic religious propaganda. His practical conclusion is: 'Try to draw from every religion and every race its whole moral and really social content, and then accept this without troubling about dogmas and particular symbols. In universal religious tolerance, combined with universal morality and science, we have the one great means of establishing mutual racial sympathy' (p. 28). Only thus far a Member of the Institut de France leads us.

But, as Gustav Spiller, in his paper on 'The Problem of Race Equality,' says: 'Anthropologists and travellers often unquestioningly and unsuspectingly assume that the mental traits of races are innate and fixed,' and he quotes from a letter of the first delegate to the Second Hague Conference of one of the greatest Eastern empires to the Congress Executive, the view of the fundamental oneness of humanity which 'ethnic consciousness' cannot destroy: 'Races show nothing but skin-deep differences. Differences of language, of religion, of manners and customs, are nothing but accidental modalities attendant on the respective historical evolution in the past—in no way sufficiently powerful to efface the substratum common to all humanity, and in no way tending to hinder any co-operative effort in the fulfilment of the mission common to mankind in general' (p. 36).

The question of language may be passed over, or, says Professor Margoliouth, 'of the various ties which bind human beings together that of a common language seems to possess no great strength,' and 'even where religion and nationality are able to maintain the inter-breeding group in its purity, they often fail to maintain the national language.' 'Like the Sabbath, like weights and measures, like the coinage, language exists for man, not man for language.' 'The advantage to Europe and to mankind of a common language would be infinitely greater than any loss which could be sustained through the abandonment of a national language' (pp. 59-60).

The question of religion is really more important; but, as Professor and Mrs. Davids remark in opening: 'The more one thinks about this

subject, the more complicated and difficult it appears to be' (p. 62). The necessary facts have not yet been collected, and no attempt has yet been made to deal with the question as a whole by scientific method. The sweeping generalizations of Professor Fouillée may therefore be discounted. Conclusions can as yet be drawn only from isolated instances. 'The violent propagation of Mohammedanism, strewing its path with ruins, but creating vast religious agglomerations, is a good illustration of religion in its twofold aspect of dissociation and aggregation. On the other hand, religion seems to seek the salvation of the individual rather than cohesion in salvation. Often, however, the religious pretext serves to conceal motives of a different kind: the Saracen conquests and the Crusades aimed equally at the possession of rich and coveted lands' (Abstracts of Papers, p. 4).

It is to founders and reformers rather than to propagandists of religion that we are to look for the unifying element in religions. 'Founders and reformers in all religions reveal the great heart that yearns to gather the human brood together in love and concord. But the fierce missionary more often appeals to individual interest' (p. 63). Religion must not be blamed for the lower motives exhibited in so-called religious wars. 'Never has any one of them approached the spiritual plane of the one host or the other in the Holy War dreamt of by our John Bunyan—the celestial armies of the Lord of hosts, and the battalions of evil spirits bent on the spiritual ruin of mankind and the reconquest of heaven. It needs a child's simple faith to people the camps of Crusaders or Covenanters with hearts burning with the white purity and single-mindedness of a Joan of Arc. It is as impossible to imagine the first Christians going forth, sword in hand, to slay unbelievers, as it is to picture a Buddhist, first or last, taking up arms against his fellow-creatures.' The Christian standard is explicitly affirmed in the following sentences: "Put up thy sword again into the sheath," said Jesus to His first Crusader. "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." Nor can the militant Christian justly infer from the words: "I came not to send peace, but a sword," that it was a Christian's duty to be he who should draw the sword. Unmodified, unqualified for early Christians as for all Buddhists, is St. James's answer to his own

question: "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" (p. 64).

The three great roots of man's misery preached by Buddhism are greed, enmity, and *moha*, or unintelligence. 'It was over a Jerusalem that, with unintelligent, uncomprehending orthodoxy, persecuted the messengers of a new and purer word that Jesus wept. 'If thou hadst known,' hadst understood, hadst discerned, 'the things that belong to thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes.' That rulers and statesmen may discern in the rallying and concentrating attending a war, the best occasion for effecting political unity, is conceivable. But it is impossible to conceive any mind that has really grasped the spirit of an ethical religion, of a creed confessing a benevolent deity, to loose the dogs of war upon his fellow-men, or to coerce belief by prison or the stake. The stupidity behind 'man's inhumanity to man' is perhaps the most tragic thing about it' (p. 65).

Unlike Professor Fouillée, Professor and Mrs. Davids realize that the theme—Whether religion be a disintegrating or a consolidating force is no question that can be answered by a bare Yea or Nay. 'Deeply as the religious instinct lies and stirs in the heart of man, it cannot find expression apart from his other instincts, however much it may and does serve as a cloak for them. And accordingly, as these instincts make for social disintegration or solidarity, so will be the religious activity that is pressed into their service. As the handmaid of theology, as the sanction of this or that social institution, as crystallized and formulated into a creed, or a sect within a creed, religion may become racialized. Thus narrowed, it will rather intensify the lines of cleavage between folk and folk, than bring them into closer intercourse. But as an instinct deep-rooted in the heart, religion transcends the barriers of race, in offering the bond of a common aspiration between individuals. And as the day of dogmas wears on to its long twilight, and the true inwardness of religion becomes acknowledged, we may come to invert the relation between religion as pretext, and other motives calling themselves by its name. More and more shall we take other motives as pretext and expression for the religious instinct, which is our being's noblest 'creative impulse.'¹ We shall

¹ Bergson's term, *élan vital et créateur*.

come to suffer the radioactivity of each man's religion to work in the heart as a divine spring of action, and to take, *as its pretexts*, all our aspirations for the general increase of health and knowledge, of beauty and happiness. But still will this inner spiritual fount ever make both for division and for consolidation. Men and women will, in obedience to it, meet ever more and more, as here and now, in amity and ordered effort after mutual understandings and progress in fraternity. Yet no less will the inward monitor bid this man or that woman cultivate selection and solitude; ever will it lead them now to come away and now to approach, as befits the true aristocrat of the Spirit; ever will it urge them now and again to flee alone to the Alone, to feed and recreate the vital spark of divine flame before the altar of the Ideal' (pp. 66-67).

In his paper on 'The World-Position of the Negro and Negroid,' Sir H. H. Johnston, the well-known African traveller and administrator, makes a striking contribution incidentally to the place of religion in discussing the question of education among subject races. If the opponents of the introduction of education are right, 'The mischief began,' he says, 'not with the introduction of modern education into India fifty years ago, or a hundred years ago, or, first, the setting free, and, secondly, the missionary education of the natives of Africa and the negroes of America, but with the mission and the teaching of Christ.'

Referring to Sakya-Muni, the Buddha, as a notable forerunner of Jesus Christ, he says: 'Had Buddha's teaching not been swamped by Mongolian petty-mindedness and Dravidian dreams, it might have done the work of Christianity. Undoubtedly it was a revolt against the caste prejudice of the Aryan, and its fundamental teaching was the racial equality of all men. But its ultimate effect on Asia has been of little purport. . . . But, strange to say, the teaching of Christ and His apostles . . . has possessed some unconquerable surviving influence, which began to make itself felt from the end of the fifteenth century in the humanitarian teachings of both Catholic and Protestant. These doctrines prevailed sufficiently on the public opinion of the white world not only to hold back the white man (when he had the power) from exterminating or dehumanizing the dark-skinned races which

had become subject to him; but prevailed even to force him to extend the gospel of Christ to those peoples, to regard them theoretically as equally men with his own race, and, above all, to give them the advantages of a European education' (pp. 334-335).

Although put hypothetically, one can read between the lines of the following contrasted views of the worth of Christianity: 'For aught I know, the teaching of Christ may have been the work of reactionary Nature: judging from the writings of not a few among my fellow-countrymen and others in the United States and in Germany, it must have been a wrong idea, since its practical application would inevitably tend to draw all branches of the human race together, with the ultimate result of racial fusion, of equal privileges for all human beings possessing the same degree of education, of moral and physical worth. On the other hand, the coming and teaching of Christ may have been the most remarkable event in the history of the human species since man definitely emerged from apehood; and the logical carrying out of Christian principles may lead not only to the gradual extinction of race-hatred, envy and malice, but more quickly to the formation of the perfect man than might be brought about under other religious systems' (p. 335).

Still more explicitly does Sir H. H. Johnston express his views on Christianity in the remarkable article in the August *Contemporary Review*, entitled 'Racial Problems and the Congress of Races': 'The Christian principles that were laid down in the authentic Gospels and Epistles still remain unsurpassed as a rule of conduct, as a basis of practical ethics,' and his plea is: 'If only in this battle [against natural forces] we could agree upon a common Inter-racial Religion, and that the most simple undogmatic form of Christianity—Christianity without the creeds that were unknown to Christ!' Not that he desires to do away with the creeds and liturgies of Christendom and the other great religions. 'If some such Inter-racial Congress . . . could define a religious basis on which all nations and civilized races could agree . . . and on this basis regulate their inter-racial, international dealings, then in their own homes and local temples they could still continue to carry on other forms of worship of divine, human, animal, vegetable, or meteoric attributes (one word "Divine" covers all these phases of life

and energy), such as were not inconsistent with the principles of the basic religion. There could still survive the stately ritual of the Latin Church, the beautiful service of the Anglican Cathedral, even the more reasonable practices of Jain Buddhism and the prayers to Allah as seen through the mental vista of pure-minded Moham-medans.'

Whether any Congress, representative either of Races or Religions of Educators or of Christian Missionaries, or a World Congress representative of all could agree upon 'a common Inter-racial Religion,' may be doubted; but that each of these Congresses held since the opening of the twentieth century have made, and will continue to make, valuable contributions to a better understanding of the problems of race, religion, and education, cannot be doubted. Meanwhile we do well to

note, with Professor Caldecott, that 'the three propagandist Religions are now definitely and explicitly dissociated from race-privileges,' and hope that 'those religions which are still closely attached to race-limitations will, when brought into mutual conference, be affected by the sentiment of unity, and consider seriously for themselves the possibility of a new valuation of their separative features' (p. 303). 'I hope we may take it,' he adds, 'that all the religions which include a desire to extend their influence will be glad both to contribute counsel and to receive it, in the important task of selecting the *universalia* of humane ethical and social order' (p. 310). And so may be brought to light the universalistic and idealistic elements of religions that are ethnic and non-propagandist, 'so that we may all proceed together in a common task' (p. 310).

Entre Nous.

Poetry.

Among the books of poetry of the month the first place should be given to a new volume of Dr. John Brownlie's translations from the Service Books of the Holy Eastern Church. It is the sixth volume that Dr. Brownlie has thus translated and published. Its title is *Hymns from the Morningland* (Paisley: Gardner; 3s. 6d. net).

Let the next be a little thing on *St. John in the Isle of Patmos*, by Alfred L. Woodard (Allenson; 1s. net).

O God of the Sunlight, sweep away
The memory of that evil day,
That drags me down to death:
Wash me, and draw me up above,
Cleanse me in Thine own cleansing love,
With Thine own quickening breath:
Make me one with the endless sea;
One with the wind on the rain-drenched lea—
One with Thee—God of Love.

The man who could write that has felt. He who calls for cleansing with such passionate utterance will find cleansing, and through much tribulation enter the Kingdom. The poetry in

Desmond Mountjoy's *The Hills of Hell* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net) is not all at that height of passion. Nor is it always the expression of so manifest an aspiration. The very next poem is entitled 'Cui Bono?'

I have cast my sword at the feet of the foe,
Now Evil may come and Good may go:
Impatient of Wrong, yet hopeless of Right,
I have lost the spirit and will to fight.

But it is poetry. And where the author does not give help he needs help.

The surest touch among all the volumes of the month is found in John Drinkwater's *Poems of Men and Hours* (David Nutt). And there is a wideness in it like the wideness of God's mercy. For John Drinkwater recognizes God in the Universe and in his own life. Thus his outlook is more comprehensive, his insight more reliable. We may quote:

THE SOLDIER.

The large report of fame I lack,
And shining clasps and crimson scars,
For I have held my bivouac
Alone amid the untroubled stars.

My battlefield has known no dawn
 Beclouded by a thousand spears;
 I've been no mounting tyrant's pawn
 To buy his glory with my tears.

It never seemed a noble thing
 Some little leagues of land to gain
 From broken men, nor yet to fling
 Abroad the thunderbolts of pain.

Yet I have felt the quickening breath
 As peril heavy peril kissed—
 My weapon was a little faith,
 And fear was my antagonist.

Not a brief hour of cannonade,
 But many hours of bitter strife,
 Till God of His great pity laid
 Across my brow the leaves of life.

Never before were there so many women who could write poetry. Or at any rate never before were there so many who did write poetry. Verse makers there have been in plenty among the women of every generation, but poetry is another matter. Margaret Blaikie is one of our poets. In her new volume, *Songs by the Way* (Fifield), there is not a line but is poetry. And sometimes it is poetry of a high imagination and a daring creed. Take this poem on Cain for a witness. The title is:

BROTHERS.

Cain my brother, my elder brother,
 Harken, I cry to thee.
 Pardon me for thy fault, O brother,
 Pardon me.
 Mine was the sin,—now mine the pain,
 Brother Cain.

I cried to the Just to avenge my death.
 The Just accuseth me.
 Mine was the guilt of the dreadful death,
 (Harken to me.)
 Mine the sin of that crimson stain,
 Brother Cain.

Oft in the field, at the fold, my brother,
 I angered thee,
 Taunted thee in my pride, O brother,
 (Pardon me.)
 Pardon the sin of my disdain,
 Brother Cain.

Mine was the guilt, all mine, my brother,
 (Harken to me.)
 My heart cries to thy heart, loved brother,
 Pardon me.
 Pardon him whom his pride hath slain,
 Brother Cain.

The admirers of Mr. H. G. Wells are admirers of his short stories. Few of the great novelists can write short stories. But Mr. Wells can. More than that, he can tell what a short story should be. He has rigidly rejected, he has banned and burned quite a number of short stories which he has written, and all the rest, he says, that are worth keeping he has gathered into a single volume and called it *The Country of the Blind* (Nelson; 2s. net).

Under the title of *Comfortable Words for Christ's Lovers*, the Rev. Dundas Harford, M.A., has described and edited the MS. of Lady Julian's Visions which was discovered recently at Lord Amherst's sale and purchased for the British Museum (Allenson; 1s. 6d. net). It is really, in the opinion of this editor, the first edition of the Revelations, the longer form being the outcome of twenty years' meditation.

A fairy book, and a fairy book that is really meant for children, is a book called *Nature Stories* written by Louie Jesse (Pitman; 2s. 6d. net). The illustrations match the narrative. Both belong unmistakably to the real world of imagination.

Canon Jessopp's Sermons.

The following letter is published in the *Guardian* for September 1: Sir,—I have a stock of old sermons which must approach a thousand in number, very few of which I shall ever preach again; and yet they have their merits and might peradventure be useful to other preachers, young and old. They have been preached to very different congregations—villagers, townsmen, learned Societies (including three Universities), soldiers, sailors, Inns-of-Court, Chapels Royal, four or five Cathedrals, Westminster Abbey—on special occasions and by special appointment. But far the larger number of these sermons have

been preached before country villagers, among whom the greater part of my life has been passed during the last thirty years.

My preaching days are over, and I shall preach no more. I very rarely preach from a MS. now. I have drawers full of my old homilies, and a manuscript sermon is of very little use to me. My habit for long has been to preach without book, as the phrase has it, and that for more reasons than one, on which I need not dwell. I shall not often preach again 'with book or without it.'

I know that scores, and more than merely scores, of my old sermons are worth preaching, and that they ought to be preached for the good of ordinary congregations. When I pick them out for delivery I am often surprised at their force, their earnestness, their acuteness, and their eloquence. The conviction has been growing upon me that these sermons of mine deserve to be delivered in other churches and other pulpits than these where they were preached in years gone by.

I venture to make an offer to my clerical brethren who, in so many cases, have a quite inadequate time for preparing the weekly sermons. I am prepared to offer my younger clerical brethren little bundles of my old sermons which have done duty during the last forty years or so, if they will give a promise never to preach any sermon of mine till they have read it twice aloud before they make use of it in the pulpit. And if they will read it once in silence, and with the eye also, all the better for them and their congregations.

My preaching days are over, but if my juniors can with earnestness and humility avail themselves of such sympathetic help as I should be glad to afford them, let them by all means enter into correspondence with me. It may be that my counsel may prove useful, and my sympathy afford some small measure of guidance if a correspondence should ensue.

AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, Rector of Scarning.

Scarning Rectory, Norfolk.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. H. J. Allen, Moresby Rectory, Whitehaven.

Illustrations for the Great Text for November must be received by the 1st of October. The text is Ps 119¹⁰⁵.

The Great Text for December is Ps 126⁶:

'Though he goeth on his way weeping,
bearing forth the seed;
He shall come again with joy, bringing
his sheaves with him.'

A copy of Dean's *Visions and Revelations*, or of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 139⁷:

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

A copy of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or Kennett's *Early Ideals of Righteousness*, together with any volume of the 'Epoch Makers' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Is 28¹⁶—
'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts,' or Durell's *The Self-Revelation of Our Lord*, or Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Rom. 15⁴—'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.' A copy of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.